

The Council met at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 25th of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[*Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—*

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Irregular procedure of the Acting Principal, Government College, Mangalore.

1387 Q.—Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS : Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(1) whether the present acting Principal of the Government College, Mangalore, compelled every student of the second year University class to pay a subscription of Re. 1 each for an 'At Home' held by the Principal and the staff to meet Mrs. Sarojini Nayudu on the occasion of her visit to Mangalore to preside over the Karnataka Provincial Congress Conference ;

(2) whether the Principal fined Re. 1 extra such students as did not promptly pay up the subscription, either because of their inability or because they did not participate in the 'At Home' ;

(3) whether the fines thus levied have been credited to the Government account ;

(4) whether the Government have taken or propose to take any action in this matter ;

(5) how many hours of actual class work the present acting Principal of the Government College does ; and

(6) how many hours of class work his predecessors, Messrs. Malim and Krishnamma, used to take up when they were in charge of the college ?

A.—Government are enquiring into the allegations contained in this interpellation.

Supply of salt to prisoners.

1388 Q.—Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the quantity of salt allowed to each prisoner in the district jails is considered sufficient ;

(b) whether any complaints have been received regarding insufficiency of salt in the rations given to prisoners ;

(c) whether the prisoners who have been now undergoing terms of imprisonment for picketing at abkari sales and for similar offences in the Berhampur district jail have suffered in health owing to insufficient supply of salt ; and

(d) when and by whom the quantity of salt to be rationed out to each prisoner was fixed ?

[25th March 1922]

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) A letter signed by the hon. Member and another Member of Council containing statements among other things as to the insufficiency of salt and as to the health of some of the prisoners has been received and Government have called for a report.

(d) The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to G.O. No. 714, Judicial, dated 17th April 1913, which has been placed on the Editors' Table.

Punitive police in certain villages of the Anantapur district.

1389 Q.—Mr. P. SIVA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have placed punitive police over the villages of Kodavandlapalli, Marthad and Doragal villages and their hamlets in the Kadiri taluk in the Anantapur district;

(b) if so, for what period; what the strength is of the police and the additional expenditure involved;

(c) what the reasons were for taking such a step; whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table the Gazette notification ordering the same and all connected papers;

(d) how many villages are comprised within the area and what their total population is;

(e) whether the Government propose to construct a permanent additional police station with lines for the use of the punitive police; if so, what the total estimated cost of the buildings is and how much of it is proposed to be recovered from the inhabitants of the locality; and whether construction has commenced;

(f) whether it has been decided in what proportions and by which persons the additional cost should be borne; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to place the order relating to the same, with the reports on which it is based and all other connected papers, on the table; and

(g) how many crimes have been reported from the police station of Kodavandlapalli in the Kadiri taluk since the imposition of the punitive police?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) For three years from 15th July 1921. The strength of the force is 1 head constable and 20 constables and the total cost is about Rs. 5,472 per annum.

(c) The reason for imposing the force was the great increase of crime in the area concerned due to protracted party feuds and factions between the influential Reddis of the locality. The notification was published at page 665 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 5th July 1921.

(d) Three villages with a total population of 2,513.

(e) Certain semi-permanent buildings are necessary for the additional police at Kodavandlapalli. The cost of these, estimated at Rs. 9,168, will be recovered from the inhabitants of the three villages referred to in clause (a), and work on them has already commenced.

25th March 1922]

- (f) Under section 15 (4) of the Police Act, 1861, this is a matter which is left to the discretion of the District Magistrate and no specific proposals have been received from him.
(g) The Government have no information.

II

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answers to question No. 1213 asked by Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu and the supplementary question put by M. R. Ry. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 21st January 1922, the Secretary laid on the table G.O. No. 329, dated 16th March 1922.

III

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XXIV—LABOUR AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS—*cont.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The Council will now resume discussion of the budget for 1922-23—Demand XXIV—Labour and allied departments.”

Motion 645.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

645. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.*

“ Sir, I have first to assure this House, and especially my friends opposite (*referring to the representatives of the depressed classes*), that it is not my intention in giving notice of this motion that by this means there should be any stoppage in the progress that has been made in the amelioration of the depressed classes, or that the progress for this year or the next and the years after should in any way be arrested. I am aware, Sir, that for a long time we have been negligent in our duty towards the communities which have come to be called the Panchamas and the depressed classes. The very name is a slur on us not on them I should think. It only shows that we have not paid them the attention that they are entitled to receive at our hands. The arrangements made by the Government for uplifting the depressed classes have aroused strong feeling in this city on both sides. The Government at first appointed a Commissioner to look after the interests of the depressed classes. Unfortunately they added later on to him the duty of looking after labour and labour problems. By that means and by the unfortunate occurrences which took place last year a considerable amount of bad blood has been roused and I fear anybody who brings a motion like this is likely to be looked upon by one side or the other with those feelings in mind. So far as I am concerned, Sir, I may assure the House that those occurrences which took place last year and the feelings that the very same occurrences have roused have nothing to do with me, and if I have brought this motion, it is not because of any of those occurrences or of any of those feelings, but because in the interests of the depressed classes and in the interests of their advancement I consider that it is necessary that we should reduce the cost of the establishment that is provided for their benefit. Sir, it is unfortunate that we are not in affluent circumstances and we cannot afford to allot for the amelioration of these classes all that will be necessary. Our finances are very

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiya]

[25th March 1922]

much depleted and what we can allot for the improvement of the depressed classes is very little indeed. If out of that little we are to provide a large slice for maintaining an establishment, I beg to submit it is a short-sighted policy and we will not at all be doing them all that, as I said, they are entitled to. The whole provision that has been made for the amelioration of the depressed classes is 5 lakhs, out of which a lakh and seventy-five thousands is allotted for establishment. Then there is the other question whether this establishment, even if we agree that it should be provided, would in any way be sufficient to carry on the work; if not, whether it is not necessary that we should devise some other policy than what is involved in these establishments. The establishment that is provided is a separate establishment to look after the interests of the depressed classes and for carrying out whatever is proposed to be done for them. I may at once say, I do agree that it is absolutely necessary that there should be some officer working directly under the Executive Councillor in charge of this particular matter, to co-ordinate the work in the districts, to make a sort of programme of improvement for these depressed classes and also to see that progress is made from time to time. To that extent, Sir, I feel it is necessary to have some officer. Having said that, Sir, I do believe that it will be absolutely impossible to place the whole work under this officer for the reason, viz., that, if we do that we will have to create a large establishment in each district separately, probably one officer of the grade of a deputy collector with a large number of subordinates under him. I do not think it will be possible in the present financial condition to provide this very large establishment. I think, Sir, that when we are able to allot several lakhs for each district, then probably we can have a costly establishment for carrying out all this work in each district. But now when we have only five lakhs for the whole Presidency, to take away Rs. 1,75,000 for the costly establishment is, I think, a short-sighted policy indeed. The question may be asked what we are going to do for the amelioration of these classes of people, how we are going to have the work carried out. The works that have to be carried out in regard to these classes, Sir, come under three main heads. First, this is much more important than we are likely on a superficial view of things to take it to be the provision of wells for the water-supply of these classes.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—“ Sir, I rise to a point of order. The motion is to omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour and I wish to know whether it is in order to speak about the special agency and so on.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ My reason for dealing with this question is this, Sir. Whether we should have a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour will depend upon the policy we are going to adopt on this motion. If we are going to have the present proposals, I do not know how many more officers will be necessary on the whole. On the other hand, if the policy I would like to suggest is accepted, there will be absolutely no justification whatever for a personal assistant. So far as these wells are concerned, if only a particular amount of money is given to each local board earmarked for this particular purpose very much greater work can be done than otherwise. From the nature of things, these wells should be dispersed over the whole district and it will not be possible for any single officer or even for two or three officers to look after all these wells in a particular district. So we ought to have a costly establishment in

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

each district to look after these wells if we want a separate establishment to look after them. I do not think it will be practical politics to think that these wells could be attended to by a special agency.

“The second question is about education. There again, Sir, if an amount is given for that purpose and if it is earmarked for extension of education among the depressed classes and if it is handed over to the local boards or to the educational department, I think the work can be done satisfactorily and there will be no necessity for a special establishment.

“The third and probably the contentious portion of the work which is proposed to be done for these people is the question of house-sites. There, also, where the extent of land to be acquired is small and the provision that is made is restricted to a few people, the better course, in my opinion, will be to leave the work to the general revenue agency. I do not think a small work like that will require a special agency. It will be too costly. Where however there are big schemes to be carried out as in the districts of Tanjore or Chingleput, probably a special officer for a few months can be employed for carrying out these works as is done in other cases. For instance, whenever large acquisitions are to be made for a railway construction a special officer is appointed. Here also where necessary a separate establishment like an assistant commissioner with a staff may be appointed for the time that may be necessary to complete the scheme of acquisition. That can be easily done and that is the only case where intensive work is proposed to be done. If that scheme is accepted, I beg to submit that there will be no necessity for all the establishment provided, viz., a personal assistant, several assistant commissioners and probably also a large number of tahsildars. It will then be enough that a few tahsildars and a few revenue inspectors are left to carry on this work. As I said, a Commissioner of Labour attached to and working under the Member in charge of the department here in the headquarters will do all that is necessary for the purpose, co-ordinate the work, make a programme of the works that have to be done and see whether they are carried out from time to time. We would also gain largely in prestige and in getting things through successfully if a scheme like this is adopted because the Member in charge will be the person directly responsible and directly interested in the work and it will not be the Commissioner of Labour. A Commissioner of Labour of such high status as a man on a pay of Rs. 2,750 will not be necessary. An officer on Rs. 1,000 working as I said under the Executive Councillor in charge of the department will for this purpose be quite adequate. Even if it is considered that there is more work, to make programmes and things like that probably two assistants, one for the north and another for the south, will be quite adequate. The works can be carried out by the district agency and there will be no necessity for a large establishment. It is in that view that I bring forward this proposal.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“Mr. President, I have also given notice of a similar motion and I may say that while giving notice of that, it was not at all my intention that the work in connexion with the depressed classes should in any way be interfered with. The amount of work so far done and the attention that has been paid to the depressed classes are not worth notice and the department that is costing so much has not done all that it could. In tabling this motion, it was my intention that this post of the personal assistant should be abolished

11-15 a.m.

[Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai]

[25th March 1922]

and a man from the depressed classes should be appointed under the Commissioner of Labour so that the grievances these people are suffering from and the nature of the work that has to be done may easily be brought to the notice of the Labour Commissioner. It is these people alone who know where the shoe pinches and not the others. But, if you put a man from any other community in charge of the depressed classes, he will not have the same sympathy with them as a man of their own community will have. It is far better that in connexion with this work an honorary man, or an assistant on a smaller pay from the same community should be appointed."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I also rise, Sir, to support this motion. It is unnecessary for me to emphasize what has been said both by the mover of the motion and by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai who stated that there was no intention whatever in moving this motion to deprive the depressed classes of the benefits they are reaping from this commission. It is certainly desirable to advance their interests as much as possible and the most important work that is done on their behalf in this department is the acquisition of sites for their dwellings. No doubt other kinds of work also are being attended to in this department; for instance, the reclamation of Kallars, the education of the depressed classes and so on. But probably, as I stated, the most important work is the acquisition of house-sites for these classes. My friend the hon. the Law Member who is in charge of this department will correct me if I am wrong when I say that the districts where this kind of work are specifically being carried on, that is the acquisition of house-sites."—"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"May I ask a question, Sir? The motion now is to take away the personal assistant to the Labour Commissioner. It is not proposed to abolish the Labour Commissioner and he is expected to do the duties which are now devolving on him and as such there is no good in our discussing whether we should have a special agency or an ordinary agency or any other thing in the district. The question solely for the consideration of the House is whether the Labour Commissioner should have a personal assistant or not for discharging his duties as a Commissioner."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu) :—"It appears to me that this question which is now being discussed as to the range and amount of work has a bearing upon this point, viz., what the volume of work involved is and whether that work requires the appointment of a personal assistant under the head of the department."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Quite so; thank you, Sir. In fact, if you had not given a ruling at once, Sir, that was exactly what I was going to submit as my important reason for entering into these questions. Thank you again, Sir, for the ruling that you have given. I was going to observe, Sir, that the special districts where this kind of work has been going on were Chingleput, Tanjore and Godavari. I believe the activities of this kind of work in the Chingleput district have ceased, if not completely, at least to some extent. But this kind of work, I believe, is going on even now in the Tanjore district and in the Godavari district. The other day, Sir, a petition was presented to the President of this House formally by one of its members who represent the Tanjore district, Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar.

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Copies of that petition were distributed among the members of this House and I read it. I do not want to go into the various allegations made therein. Some of them may be exaggerated and some of them may be true or false. In any case, I may submit this, Sir, at this stage that very serious allegations are made regarding the conduct of some officials who are working in this department, and if even a tithe of those allegations be true, this department instead of doing good which it was intended to do, is, I am afraid, doing considerable harm. Of course it is for the Government —."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"What is the bearing of that upon this question?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"This way, Sir. The person against whom these allegations are made is one of the assistant commissioners of labour."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"That has not yet arisen. We are dealing with the personal assistant to the Labour Commissioner."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"You were just pleased to rule, Sir, that the policy of this department has been under discussion."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"If you wish to state that it is these allegations and things of that kind that have amplified the work of the department, and if on that account you want to suggest that the work could be reduced by the adoption of any other alternative policy, that would be all right."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"In fact, I was going on to that, Sir. The point which I was going to emphasise was this. This kind of work, viz., the acquisition of house-sites for members of the depressed classes, can best be done and done more effectively too by the ordinary revenue authorities of the district, the Collector and his staff. That was my point, Sir. (At this stage Mr. T. E. Moir wanted to say something and got up.) Well, Sir, I may say that if I am constantly interrupted by members like this, I shall be obliged to claim your indulgence for an extension of the time limit fixed for our speeches."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"I beg to rise to a point of order, Sir. The question is whether the discussion of a different policy in connexion with the whole Labour department is relevant to a motion for the abolition of the personal assistant to the labour commissioner. It may be relevant to a motion where the whole policy is sought to be changed. But I may say, Sir, that it would be rather a difficult question if on a side issue as to whether a particular post can be abolished or not, the whole question of the policy and the future development of the Labour department were to be taken into consideration."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, with reference to what my friend Mr. Moir was saying, in the first place, I submit, Sir, you have to give a ruling on this question, and secondly, no doubt the immediate question with which we are now concerned is the desirability or otherwise of abolishing the personal assistant's post. But, if it is not necessary to have a special department or to have a special commissioner for doing this kind of

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[25th March 1922]

work and if this kind of work can very well be done through the ordinary revenue agency—the Collector and his subordinates—naturally I beg to submit these things become relevant.”

“What I was going to submit, Sir, was this. The kind of work which is done and which is intended to be done can better be done 11-30 a.m. by the Collector and the ordinary revenue establishment working under him. As a matter of fact, now, there is the Labour department with a Commissioner at its head and a number of revenue inspectors and tahsildars working under him. Instead of the work being facilitated, I have been told the natural result is friction between this particular department and the ordinary Revenue department. This friction will certainly disappear and be eliminated if this work is entrusted to the ordinary Revenue department. After all, Sir, it is the ordinary Revenue department which has the best opportunities of attending to this work. The Collector and his assistants, the divisional assistants, the tahsildars and others that work under him know the conditions of the district better than the special officers who to-day may be working in this district and to-morrow may be transferred to another district. With reference to this point one other thing strikes me. The head of the department has two functions, namely, as protector of the depressed classes and also as protector of labour. I submit it is highly incongruous that these two functions should be combined in the same individual. With reference to what unfortunately took place in the city of Madras last year,—I refer to the Puliyantope disturbances—though we members from the mufassal have no special interest in what takes place in Madras—we are under the impression after a perusal of what took place that the Commissioner of Labour found himself in a very embarrassing and difficult position because he had two different kinds of duties which were conflicting with one another. For as a protector of labour he had certainly to look to all classes of labour, whether they were members of the Adi-Dravida community, or of the Muhammadan community or were caste men. But as the director of the depressed classes he had to attend particularly to the interests of the depressed classes. As was notorious, the members of the depressed classes came in collision with the labourers belonging to other communities, so that it is unfair, I submit, Sir, to the Labour Commissioner to be in charge of these two kinds of duties which sometimes cannot be reconciled one with the other. For these reasons, Sir, I support the resolution.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“In speaking on this motion I wish to steer clear of all controversial topics. I do not for a moment consider about the policy or the justification for the existence of this department at all. It does not directly arise out of this particular issue. Nor is it necessary for me to consider whether it is desirable to tack on the Labour department with any other department. It is not my purpose to discuss whether a special department is necessary at all or whether it is not better to leave the matter to the ordinary revenue authorities. Confining myself to the particular question whether a personal assistant is necessary at all, I wish to show that his salary is about Rs. 4,240 per annum, his duty allowance Rs. 1,200 and his conveyance allowance is Rs. 1,200 per annum. In all he costs about Rs. 6,600 per annum. Now where is the justification for this personal assistant? In this connexion we have to consider the volume of work turned out by the Labour Commissioner and whether he would really require the assistance of a personal

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

assistant. The first duty that is assigned to this Labour Commissioner is the amelioration of the condition of the depressed classes. When I support this motion I should not be misunderstood as saying that the depressed classes do not require our utmost care and attention. On the other hand, I am one of those who believe that the regeneration of our country depends mostly upon the amelioration of the present condition of the depressed classes. I am not suggesting that these depressed classes do not require any special or preferential treatment at the hands of the Government.

“Coming to the duties of the Labour Commissioner, I find that the amelioration of the depressed classes seems to be the foremost. Besides this, he is entrusted with the control of the agricultural and industrial settlement work, acquisition of house-sites for the depressed classes which I understand is taking place in three districts of the presidency, amelioration of the condition of the backward tribes such as the Chenchus of Nallamalai and the Kallars of Malabar, and supervision of factories and labour. Considering all these duties, considering also the number of schools which the Labour Commissioner has to supervise—I think the number is 470—considering also the criminal settlement work over which he has got the final control—I think they are 12 in number—the question seriously arises whether we would do well to spend Rs. 6,000 and odd for this costly machinery of a personal assistant. I must unhesitatingly say, Sir, that there is no necessity for a personal assistant. We should also remember that the Labour Commissioner has three assistant labour commissioners under him. There is the Revenue department and the district executive force waiting to co-operate with him. The question is whether an assistant in the shape of a manager on a salary of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 will not do. To me a personal assistant costing 6,000 and odd seems to be a luxury. There is no sufficient duty for him.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, within the five minutes at my disposal I do not propose to travel into the policy of having a Labour department to do special work on behalf of the Panchamas. I must say this at once, viz., that after an experience of 30 years and after investigation by special officers ranging over five years we came to the deliberate conclusion that this work on behalf of the depressed classes could not possibly be done and it was not done by the ordinary revenue divisional staff. If you are going to do this work you must have a special staff and a special establishment for the purpose of doing this work. I will read only one passage from a letter which we sent to the Government of India asking for this special department. It was, as I said, as a result of 30 years' experience and five years' detailed enquiry that we asked for it.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Is the document that he is reading from placed on the table?”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I will place every paper here on the table.”

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu) :—“I believe after all he has not read from it as yet.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The question is whether this work should go on or should not go on. We shall have to do this work by a special establishment. Experience has shown that the Revenue department cannot possibly attend to this work. We gave the depressed classes facilities for acquiring land for cultivation; we afforded them facilities

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[25th March 1922]

for getting poramboke lands for house-sites and in many other matters we afforded them various kinds of facilities; but the progress was nearly none. 'This fact is due largely to the ignorance of these classes and partly, perhaps, to the lack of sympathy displayed by subordinate officials; and even where the Government officers have the requisite sympathy, they have not the time to undertake the large volume of propaganda work involved in the initiation of measures on a large scale and in carrying them out in detail.' There is one fact in this connexion to which I wish to draw prominent attention. The special department has undertaken the work in two or three districts as was pointed out. The special department has not got sufficient funds to undertake work in the neighbouring taluks. Instructions are given that the Assistant Labour Commissioner should finish one taluk and then go to another; and if any applications are received from the neighbouring taluk they must be transferred to the ordinary revenue officials for disposal. This rule has been in existence from 1920; none of that work has been done by the ordinary revenue officials. Now I shall confine myself to the personal assistant. You will find, Sir, that the personal assistant is of the grade of a deputy collector who gets a salary ranging from Rs. 300 to Rs. 850 according to his grade. This personal assistant is in the headquarters assisting the Labour Commissioner in the various duties he has to discharge. The Labour department, at the head of which is the Labour Commissioner, deals with the following: administration of the Factories Act, working of the Planters' Labour Act, working of the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act, emigration of labour, labour bureau and employment bureau, wages census, industrial disputes—this on the side of industrial labour—management and control of settlements under the Criminal Tribes Act and investigations into the conditions of the depressed classes and also hill tribes outside the Agency tracts and measures for their advancement. These are the various kinds of work that he has to do. I shall just tell you what is being done merely for the collection of labour statistics elsewhere. For the purpose of merely collecting labour statistics, they have a labour office in Bombay costing Rs. 70,000. There is a Statistics Commissioner at the head of the department who is drawing, I believe, exactly the same salary as the Labour Commissioner here. There is a separate officer for the purpose of supervising criminal settlements. That officer and his establishment in Bombay cost Rs. 54,035, so that between these officers for labour statistics and criminal settlement alone it costs about a lakh and twenty-five thousand rupees. Our Labour Commissioner has to do both these, and also depressed classes work which is even more important than the other two in this province. He is the protector of depressed classes and the motion is to cut out the personal assistant given him. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that if you take away the personal assistant there is nobody in the headquarters except a clerk or two. There is no manager or any other person who will be responsible even for the routine business.

"Now, Sir, I had a note from the Labour Commissioner to enable us to address the Government of India and if the House wants I will read extracts from it. He says: 'To enable the Labour Commissioner to discharge more effectively the duties of his combined charge, he ought to have under him a Secretary to deal with all questions relating to industrial disputes, labour statistics, all questions affecting the Madras City and such other confidential inquiries as these matters necessitate. There must

11-45 a.m.

25th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

be a separate statistical manager who will be in charge of the labour statistics, wages, housing problems and all other problems involving economic inquiries or statistical information.' Many of the matters with which the Commissioner of Labour deals are matters regarding the depressed classes and require his personal inspection and supervision. I forgot to mention that he has got to go on tour for the purpose of seeing whether the industrial settlements are being properly worked. When the Commissioner thus goes on tour, there should be some officer at the headquarters to deal with all general questions and for this purpose there should be a personal assistant of the grade of a deputy collector in separate charge of the depressed classes, criminal settlements, emigration, factories, etc. Now, Sir, we were of opinion that there should really be two separate departments, one dealing with the industrial labour and the other dealing with the depressed classes. If the House is prepared to sanction funds to have these two departments under separate heads I shall be extremely pleased. But in our present financial state we cannot afford it and we are getting on with one single Labour Commissioner to do both these functions. The House will remember that for the purpose of making some inquiry into the statistics, we had a deputy commissioner for some time last year. We have not got him now. If then we take away even the personal assistant, it means that the Labour Commissioner cannot possibly go on tour. That means he cannot effectively discharge his duties of supervision over the depressed classes work. That is the position which the House will be reducing itself to. But if it is desirous of abolishing the whole department, then let them say so. Don't say that you want a Labour Commissioner but would not give him a sufficient establishment. Every head of a department has got a personal assistant of the grade of a deputy collector and some departments have got more than one personal assistant, and they have all been accepted by this House. Why should not this particular head of the department have a personal assistant? If we expect him to do the duties which are imposed upon him he must have one."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"At first I did not want to intervene in the debate on this question. But the hon. the Law Member has gone into the programme of work that is being done by these officers. I think it is necessary to say something in connexion with this question of abolishing the personal assistant. It is said that it is absolutely necessary for the purpose of carrying on the work in the city, at any rate, that there should be a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. If he is to be confined only to the office, as personal assistants to the Collectors are, I for one should have had no objection to that. But to do the duties of the Commissioner of Labour during his absence and that for the City of Madras, though for the mufassal other people might do the work, it is said that such a personal assistant is necessary. Now, we have to put against the Government of India's orders speaking as to the absence of any substantial work for the past 30 years, the experience gained during the period during which this establishment has been at work, i.e., for a few months or few years in Madras. Sir, last year in the budget debate, I had to remark with reference to the Labour Department that the impression was gaining ground, whether by accident or otherwise, that the longer the Labour Commissioner's Department was in existence, the longer had been the period of strikes. At that time I was only thinking of the long strike in October, November, December and January of 1919 and 1920. Subsequently, after that remark was made, we have had

[[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

that long strike which has involved Madras in those dark things about which I need not speak at present. No doubt, as personal assistant, the personal assistant has been going about. We know how things have been going on during that period. Of course, I do not wish to revive the memories of Puliantope. We had to complain how every time there was disorder there was the Commissioner of Labour along with the police. But as to how that administration went on, we may refer to the report made by Sir William Ayling's Committee and how far the work of the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour or of the Labour Commissioner himself has been of benefit to the labourers or the depressed classes can also be seen from that. I refer to a note made by our esteemed friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu. He concluded his report by saying: 'I will close this note with a remark or two on the subject relating to the condition of these pitiable men who had to get on without shelter, and for a time even without food.' According to the statistics furnished to the committee, 418 huts were destroyed by the several fires; of these, 269 belonged to Adi-Dravidas and 149 to others. Sixty-seven of the latter belong to chucklers (a community which my hon. Friend Mr. Guruswami has the honour to represent in this Council). Living under similar conditions and undoubtedly in similar circumstances in life, how glaringly unequal was the relief afforded to these sufferers? Over and above the contributions made by philanthropic gentlemen, a sum of Rs. 20,000 of Government money was spent on feeding and sheltering the Adi-Dravida occupants of the 269 huts, whereas the occupants of the other 149 huts received contribution to the extent of Rs. 100. How will this inequality be interpreted, Sir? To the average mind in what light will it present the authorities to the public view? What mutual feelings are likely to be fostered between these communities who are neighbours? Sir, one other thing that I wish to draw attention of the House to is to be found in the administration report issued by this department. I have said that while public money was placed at the disposal of this department for the relief of sufferers, how amongst the depressed classes themselves this money was unequally distributed, one class being completely neglected, namely the chucklers. In the administration report it is stated that the following special grants were made during the year. For the Adi-Dravida hostel in Madras a sum of Rs. 1,000 was placed at the disposal of Mr. M. C. Raja for expenditure in connexion with that hostel."

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"In this connexion I wish to say that Rs. 504 was given to me."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"When? Before or after the report?"

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"After the report."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"This report comprised the administration for the year 1920-21 and the report was issued apparently on the 7th November 1921. A sum of Rs. 1,000 is placed at the disposal of Mr. Raja in connexion with the Adi-Dravida hostel to be opened in Madras. I asked Mr. Somasundaram Pillai as to where this hostel was and to give me some other information relating to it; but he could not give me any information. I asked my friend Mr. Guruswami and he said that he knew nothing."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"Does the hon. Member mean to suggest that we placed Rs. 1,000 at the disposal of Mr. Raja for a hostel which did not exist?"

25th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ All that I say is I asked Mr. Soma-sundaram Pillai for information and he says that he does not know anything about it. I ask whether this amount was made available equally to all sections of the depressed classes. While it is said that efforts are being made to alleviate the distress among these communities, are the contributions which are placed at the disposal of this department equally distributed? I do not propose to speak at great length as to the necessity of having a personal assistant.

“ Dealing with the class of work which has to be done, we were told about the criminal settlements. Sir, no doubt, it all sounds very big to speak of supervision over criminal settlements. I would refer the House to page 11 of the administration report of the Labour department. In respect of almost every one of the criminal settlements the money provision that has been allotted has been handed over to respectable agencies such as the Salvation Army, American Mission, Messrs. Parry & Co. at Kulasekarapatnam and to other agencies. In fact the policy relating to the handing over of money intended for these settlements to these agencies was questioned in this House.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I ask whether all this is relevant to the question whether the head of the department requires a personal assistant? It seems to me to be entirely irrelevant.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ It is perfectly relevant having regard to the speech made by the hon. the Law Member in which he said that these are the various duties which the Labour Commissioner has to discharge and for which he requires the assistance of a personal assistant.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ May I mention, Sir, that I raised a point of order on this question that all this is not relevant but I believe the Chairman over-ruled me?”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I submit, Sir, that the question in issue is whether there is work for the personal assistant or not; and whether it has been well or ill done is not relevant?”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ The hon. the Law Member referred amongst other things to the various duties to be done by the Labour Commissioner and said that therefore he required the assistance of a personal assistant. Therefore, I am also entitled to say that it is a duty which does not involve much work because as I see, out of Rs. 1,60,000 allotted for criminal settlements, a sum of about Rs. 1,40,000 has been handed over to these respectable bodies, the Salvation Army, the Missionaries, Parry & Co., etc. I think that when last year it was asked whether it was right to entrust monies for the uplift of these communities to those bodies who might have an inclination to convert them and so on, the House by a majority approved the principle of entrusting the money to them; because it was said that they did the work as a matter of love and the money that was paid to them could not cover the ordinary managing expenses by an independent agency. Under these circumstances, having approved the principle of entrusting the management of these communities to the respectable bodies, to say that the Commissioner of Labour has to do much supervision work is not correct.

“ As regards the labour bureau, employment bureau, wages census, we know what kind of census is being taken. After the trouble in Puliyan-tope was over, I put the question what the number of Adi-Dravidas working

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiya]

[25th March 1922]

in the mills was and what the number of caste people. When they are posing that they are doing a lot of census work, they were not able to give me this information. I have a candid confession from the Government that the Government are unable to give me information. That is the kind of census work that is being done.

“As for the working of the Planters Act, steps are being already taken to repeal that Act. That is the information I gathered. As regards Workmen's Breach of Contract Act, absolutely nothing seems to have been done.

“As for emigration of labour, we know formerly the Collector of Madras was doing this work. Towards the amelioration of depressed classes, this report says that out of Rs. 2 lakhs allotted for that purpose, $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs was taken for establishment and the remaining 50 thousand was set apart for miscellaneous work, such as sinking of wells, acquisition of sites for foot-paths, etc. So in the name of the depressed classes for whom two lakhs of rupees have been set apart, $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs went for establishment and half a lakh only actually went for their benefit. Under these circumstances, Sir, and when various suggestions are made for working this department on a reorganized basis giving these people the benefit of the protector of depressed classes, without any intermediate officers who rather hinder the work than advance it, I ask that this motion may be supported and passed by this House.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—“The only point

12 noon.

which the hon. the Law Member urged against this motion being accepted was that experience of the past 30 years showed that ordinary district agencies could not be expected to do the necessary work and to devote the required attention to the depressed classes. Well, Sir, the proposal that I make is that a protector of depressed classes should work directly under the Law Member himself, and that he should co-ordinate the work and should also see whether the proposals made by him are carried out. I am sure if effect is given to my proposals, the failure in the past can be remedied. Then the hon. the Law Member stated that there are in Bombay a Labour Commissioner and also a Superintendent of Criminal Settlements. Well, Sir, he stopped with Bombay and did not go to the other presidencies for the simple reason that there are no such officers in those places.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“There are superintendents of criminal settlements in other provinces and the statistical work is also being done in other provinces.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—“I believe, Sir, that from what I read from the proceedings of the conference of the Directors of Industries for last year, it was only in Bombay they had a Labour department. In Calcutta they appear to have a bureau of labour, and in no other presidency there is such a department like this. I know that the conference paid special attention to what was done in Madras, and I believe the conclusion they came to was that the department of labour ought to be placed under the Director of Industries and should not be under the Commissioner of Labour. For the labour work to be done under the Director of Industries, there ought to be a personal assistant in charge of these labour statistics just as we have a personal assistant under the Director of Agriculture to prepare agricultural statistics. That is the way in which things ought to be done

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

and it is not right to have this Labour Department tacked to the protector of the depressed classes. It was then stated that there was no manager in the office and so a personal assistant was necessary."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"What I stated was that there was none to look after the work in the office if the personal assistant was taken away, not that the manager in an office can do the work of a personal assistant."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"If the work entrusted to the protector of the depressed classes is to be as I propose, then there will be no necessity for a personal assistant, and a manager in the office will be quite ample. So, Sir, the reply given by the hon. the Law Member does not go to demolish my arguments. I am not at all concerned with the past history of the particular persons employed in the Labour Department or whether the work was done well or ill by those who were in charge. I only raise a general question. I have clearly stated what I have to say, and I do not think I have heard anything from the hon. the Law Member to change my opinion. Under these circumstances, I press my motion for the acceptance of the House."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—"What is the time allotted for the discussion of this demand?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think it is half a day."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"Sir, the motion on the agenda is to omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. Sir, being myself a member of the depressed classes, I have closely come in contact with the work of the Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour referred to in this motion, and I know somewhat the work which he is carrying on in the office. I do not think any other hon. Member in this Council except my hon. Friend Mr. Guruswami knows the volume of work that is done by the personal assistant here in Madras. The personal assistant in Madras is not a personal assistant such as you see in other offices. Here the personal assistant is also doing some executive work. The protector of the depressed classes being a touring officer throughout the whole Presidency he is absent sometimes nearly for the whole month, and therefore during his absence it is essential that there should be a responsible officer in the office to carry on the work, of course, on the lines laid down by the Labour Commissioner. If you do away with this personal assistant, it would be simply to cripple the work of the Labour Commissioner, and we would consider that as aiming at the interests of our community. My hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar when he opened the debate said that he was not for stopping or arresting the progress of the work that was being done. But I ask, if you do not have efficient men, how can you carry on the work? Some of the hon. Members tell me: 'We are giving you 5, 10 and 15 lakhs of rupees; why do you want officers.' I answer them: 'You are giving us money to construct houses and at the same time you are asking us not to employ efficient men to do the work; you would not allow us to employ good maistris or good engineers and you also ask us not to use good bricklayers.' It is something like that when you do not want this personal assistant and yet you say: 'We are not against the progress of the depressed classes.' My hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar also said that the great non-Brahman Hindu community did not pay sufficient attention to these classes. That is

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[25th March 1922]

the very fact, Sir, why you should pay particular attention now to these classes; that is the very reason why you should employ efficient men, and that is the very reason why you should spend more money on this special kind of work which requires a great deal of energy and enthusiasm. If you are not going to employ efficient men to do this work, you may as well abolish the Labour Department and leave things as they are. We consider this motion as an attempt to do away with the useful work done for the depressed classes. I am not speaking on my own behalf, the individual 'Raja'. I am ventilating here what my community has said in a conference last week. I am not going to swallow the pills that you are giving me, however sugar-coated they may be. I am responsible to my community, and I am simply voicing in this Council the instructions they gave me.

"My hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, the loud-mouthed champion of the non-Brahmans, comes out and says that a *thousand* rupees was given to the Adi-Dravida Students' Hostel. I wish to know what his intention is. He says at one time: 'Do not spend money over officers who protect the depressed classes'; at another time he says 'I do not give money for starting a students' hostel'. Is this the sympathy that he evinces towards the depressed classes?"

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"My point was that the money did not go to the whole of the depressed classes."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"I will ask my hon. Friend whether he is holding any brief for any section of the depressed classes and whether he had applied for any help on behalf of a section of my men to the protector of the depressed classes, and whether he was refused help by him. I am constrained to say, Sir, that I thought I was living in the year 1922: but now I see I am made to live in 1822. I am sorry I have to speak like this. I do not mean anything personally to my hon. friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. I am only giving out the feelings of my community."

MR. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I presided over a conference of the depressed classes, and I know their grievance is that a man of their own community should be appointed as personal assistant. They think that, if one of their own men was employed, their interests will be better served."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"I do not say that I do not want a man from my own community to be appointed as personal assistant."

"Then, you want cheap machinery to conduct the work of my people, and you want a very efficient and highly paid machinery for conducting the work of your own people. You do not go in for people with minimum qualification to attend to your work. You want efficient men, men with great intellect for your work. For Panchama work, you say: 'there is no necessity for a deputy collector, an ordinary man will do.' You know as a matter of fact, there are certain deputy collectors who are called 'Panchama deputy collectors' because they do work for the depressed classes."

"I know my hon. Friend from Trichinopoly. He is a great friend of the depressed classes and he has been taking a good deal of interest on their behalf. I do not know these things personally; but that is what I hear from my community in Trichinopoly. I think my hon. Friend wants that honorary men should be appointed to look after the interests of the depressed classes just as there are honorary co-operative assistant registrars. I wish to tell him that this work is one which requires constant attention of the worker

25th March 1922]

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

from hour to hour and day to day. He will have to devote his whole time to look after the interests of the depressed classes. Spasmodic work and work done in spare hours as is done by the honorary assistant registrars will not do. I am myself an honorary registrar and I can devote only a few hours to that work."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"I do not say that honorary men should be appointed. I say men belonging to the community of the depressed classes should be appointed."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"This is a special kind of work which requires the constant attention of good men, men specially endowed with ability as you see in public services. Unless you have able men, it is not possible to do this work satisfactorily. Therefore, I think a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour is quite essential."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"All I wish to do is to try and bring this debate back to the issue which really ought to be discussed on the motion before the House. It is for the omission of an allotment of Rs. 4,240 for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. The only issue which properly ought to be discussed and which is directly relevant to that motion is the question whether or not the Commissioner of Labour requires the assistance of a personal assistant for the proper discharge of his duties. If it is desired to question the general policy of the Labour Department, the discussion on that point ought to be initiated on subsequent motions. There are plenty of suitable motions from No. 676 onwards. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. the Law Member and others directly concerned with the department would welcome a discussion on the issue of general policy when we reach those motions. But I submit that it places those who have to answer this motion in a very difficult position, if the debate is allowed to turn on general policy."

"It is not relevant, I urge, now to rake up the questions how business has been transacted in the past, what the policy should be in the future, and whether one type of work or another should be included within the scope of the Commissioner of Labour. The only issue is whether he requires a personal assistant. If I had had any idea that the range of discussion was going to include so large a field, I would have asked you, Sir, to consider whether it would not be possible to adjourn this item under Standing Order 34 until after the discussion of motions on the broader issue of general policy. But if it is too late to suggest that course, I would still urge the House to come down from the higher atmosphere of policy to the ground level of the specific question whether a personal assistant is required or not. I happen to know something personally about the Commissioner of Labour's work in the past and what he has to do in the present. It is no use discussing details now, but I can confidently assert without any qualification that there is ample work for a personal assistant, that, if the Commissioner of Labour had no such assistant, the utility of his appointment would be very seriously reduced. One word of personal explanation before I resume my seat. One speaker has referred to the fact that the Commissioner of Labour, Mr. Moir, had happened to be present on every occasion when recourse was had to shooting during the disturbances in the mill area. I think that statement was made once before and I then replied that the reason was that Mr. Moir was exactly

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[25th March 1922]

where he ought to have been. He was doing his best to prevent the necessity for shooting. He was doing his duty under very difficult conditions, thrusting himself into the forefront of the trouble with the single idea of preventing trouble, of preventing any necessity for shooting."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"I move that the question be put."

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll. The House then divided on the closure motion as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 25. Diwan Bahadur M. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 26. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 27. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu |
| 5. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 29. " M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. O. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 30. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 7. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 31. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 32. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 33. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 10. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 34. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 35. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 36. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 37. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 14. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 38. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 39. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 40. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathurbujadoss. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 41. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | |
| 19. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | |
| 20. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | |
| 21. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Panja. | |
| 22. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | |
| 23. Mr. T. Somasundaram Pillai. | |
| 24. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 13. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 5. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 16. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 6. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 17. Rev. W. Weston. |
| 7. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 18. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 8. Mr. R. Littlehailes. | 19. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 20. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu. |
| 10. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 21. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. | 22. Sir James Simpson. |

Forty-one voted *for* and 22 *against* the motions.

Then the main motion for the omission of the allotment for the Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour was put and carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson again demanded a poll,

25th March 1922]

The House then divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 27. Diwan Bahadur M. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 29. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Mr. B. Appaswami Nayudu. | 30. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 31. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 32. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Aohari. |
| 8. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 9. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 35. Mr. A. Rangannatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 11. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 12. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 38. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 13. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 39. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 14. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 40. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 41. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 42. Saiyid Diwan Abdur-Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 43. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 44. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathurbhujadoss. |
| 19. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 45. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 20. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | |
| 21. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | |
| 22. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.] | |
| 23. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | |
| 24. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | |
| 25. Mr. T. Sonasundara Mudaliyar. | |
| 26. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. E. Periyanaayagam. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Mohammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 14. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Aohariyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayanangar. | 15. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 16. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 19. Mr. R. T. Kesavalu Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 20. Mr. G. Vantanam. |
| | 21. Sir James Simpson. |

The motion was carried, 45 having voted for and 21 against.

Motion 646.

The following motion was not moved as it referred to a matter substantially the same as that of the previous motion :—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

646. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for personal assistant.]*

Motion 647.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The following motion of Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu is out of order as the House has already decided to omit the allotment of the personal assistant whose duty allowance is referred to in this motion :—

647. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.”*

Mr. O. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, if for any reason the item is restored by His Excellency the Governor, we should like the duty allowance to go. This is a reserved department.”

[25th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am bound to deal with points of order as they arise. I am bound to rule out the motion as out of order. In regard to the contingency raised by the hon. Member, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, I really cannot take up that in regulating my decision on a point of order.”

Motions 648 to 652.

For the same reason the following motions were ruled out of order :—

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

648. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

649. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

650. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for the personal assistant.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

651. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

652. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.*

Motion 653.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

653. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 17,140 for three assistant commissioners.*

Motion 654.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

654. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 17,140 for three assistant commissioners.*

“ I have set at length my view on the subject when I spoke on the motion regarding the Personal Assistant to the Labour Commissioner. I said that there ought to be a protector of the depressed classes under the Member of the Government in charge of the portfolio. But we have no necessity for these three assistant commissioners to work in the districts. Therefore I move for the omission of the allotment.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Now I propose to deal with the question of district staff. Before I do so I want to make a statement as regards the allegations made in the petition which was presented to the House and to which a reference was made by Mr. Krishnan Nayar. There were two petitions. When the first petition was presented to me I had enquiries made with regard to those allegations by the Labour Commissioner

25th March 1922] [Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

On his enquiry it was found that the allegations made therein were not correct, and in one instance it was demonstrably false. One of the allegations was that the acquisition has been made in a village for non-Panchamas, as a default on the part of the Labour Department. It was found on inquiry that there were no acquisition proceedings at all in that village. Then, Sir, I asked the Labour Commissioner to meet Mr. Somasundaram

12-30 p.m. Mudaliyar, Mr. Vandayar and other leading mirasidars and

have a discussion with them in the presence of the Collector. He found, when he went there to discuss this question that Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar had no personal knowledge as to any of the allegations made in the petition presented by him (Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar) to me. That is what he says (I believe I have shown this report to Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar): 'On my arrival at Tanjore I discussed the matter with the Collector and Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar——' "

MR. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—" May I request the hon. Member to let me know whether I have stated anything in my letter in reference to that affair? "

The hon. MR. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" His petition is before the Council and they can judge. All that I have to do is to inquire into those allegations. This is what the Labour Commissioner says: 'On my arrival at Tanjore, I discussed the matter with the Collector, Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur Appaswami Vandayar and another mirasidar. I had hoped to get special information from this discussion which would help me in defining my inquiry which could not extend to every case mentioned. But I found Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar had no personal knowledge of any of these things. The chief point made was that the acquisition work which was intended only for the Panchamas was now being extended to other castes.' With regard to that, questions have been put in the House and I have answered them. From that the House will see that only a very small proportion of the acquisition has been made for the caste Hindus; they are economically in as bad a position as the depressed classes. I may also say that the Government Order appointing the special establishment for depressed classes expressly referred to other labourers in addition to Panchamas. He continues: 'the more definite point was that raised by Mr. Vandayar to the effect that persons of other classes for whom lands have been now acquired are not genuinely in want. On that he has personally made several inquiries in several villages.' I can give you the whole of this report, whosoever wants it. The result of those inquiries was that, as far as I could see, acquisitions had been made with great attention to the rules, the one doubtful point being the one already referred to, namely, whether the acquisition should be undertaken for small farmers. He went into this question fully and he found, fortunately for him from the books which were produced by the mirasidars themselves, that the so-called varamdar was in a worse position economically than the ordinary coolie. I had another petition presented to me. I sent it to the Labour Commissioner for inquiry. The inquiry is not complete. The investigations refer to individual cases. So far as the inquiry has gone, it has left a general impression on my mind that there is no basis for most of the allegations."

MR. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—" I want to ask whether notice has been given to the persons who have given affidavits that a regular inquiry would take place. No such notice has been given to me."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I do not wish to make it an absolutely judicial inquiry ranging for years, with vakils appearing for parties with examinations and cross-examinations. We are bound to have the assistant commissioner's explanation, and that I have. The Commissioner of Labour, if it is necessary to inquire into these cases, will give due notice to Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I rise to a point of order. The question is whether it is necessary to have three assistant commissioners. We are now going into the details of some petitions presented and the results of the inquiry. From the way in which this discussion is drifting, I hardly think that it is relevant to the point at issue."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think it is relevant. Of course the question is whether there is need for three assistant commissioners of labour. The hon. the Law Member's point is that there is a lot of work to be done, and he goes on to enumerate some of the items."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Not only that. A challenge was made that not merely the Labour Commissioner's assistants were useless for the purpose of doing that work, but it is said they were retarding the work of the amelioration of the depressed classes by coming into conflict with other officers by setting up a class conflict. The challenge was made by Mr. Krishnan Nayar. I was talking about the petitions presented here only with a view to take away any prejudice that might be entertained by any members of this House by reason of those allegations. Do not imagine that those allegations have been proved. I ask you to suspend your judgment on that."

"Now, I am not going to take up very much more time of the House. In this connexion I might draw attention to a passage which I read on the last budget debate and which I shall read again. It bears repetition. This is the deliberate opinion of the Board of Revenue as to the possibility of the ordinary revenue divisional staff undertaking this work and carrying it out successfully. 'After a careful consideration of the problem of the depressed classes, the Board has come to the conclusion that however liberal and generous the attitude of the Government towards the depressed classes may be and whatsoever may be the facilities accorded for the improvement of the condition of the community, the effect desired is not likely to be produced so long as there is no separate agency to carry out the policy of the Government in this respect. Supposing the improvement of the condition of these classes has in the past received the approval of the Government, owing to the lack of special organization they have failed in their object. There is a general indifference and even hostility to measures calculated to improve the depressed classes and the Collector has not the force or the will to carry out such measures; so they will become inoperative owing to the passive obstruction or indifference of the subordinates. It is therefore essential that a special staff of officers should be appointed as protector of depressed classes.' In any event, we want to have a person to co-ordinate the work. You may say there is the co-operative department for the purpose of doing co-operative work and the revenue divisional staff for acquisition of house-sites and that local boards will bestow their blessings on these persons if we give them enough money, or the department of education is anxious to provide education. Assuming they are to co-ordinate their activities, what

25th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

happens now is this. The special assistant commissioner goes to a particular village, makes inquiries there as regards the Panchamas. He is told that they must have house-sites, they want water-supply, the mirasidars object to their going in certain streets; he is told they have no educational facilities and their community cannot get access to the ordinary schools. Then he sets about doing or getting these things for them, addressing the proper department, if necessary. Therefore, what is required is a co-ordinating agency for the purpose of doing the whole of this work for these persons. It may be that this special agency may not be necessary years hence; but so long as they are not in a position to fight for their rights, whatever rules you may make, however much sympathy the Government or the officers concerned may have, this work cannot really be done except by a special agency appointed for this special purpose. If this work should be done, and if the House thinks that this work ought to be done, then there is no other alternative except having these officers. Let us not cloud the issue. Our 30 years' experience has shown that this work could not be done without a special agency. That is my experience and that is the experience of officers who know more about the subject than I. As I said, Sir, it is one of the rules that if the assistant commissioners of labour get any applications from a neighbouring taluk in which the special agency is not working they should send over these applications to the ordinary revenue divisional staff for them to do the work, and we know, they have not done it."

Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI :—"Mr. President, Sir, with reference to the motion set forth by some of the hon. Members of the House to retrench the Labour Department, I beg leave with all deference to put in my strongest opposition on the following grounds.

"The Labour Commissioner's department, I must point out, was a thoughtfully organized one, which was considered absolutely necessary for the amelioration of the depressed classes, and it was established before the Reform scheme came into force.

"I was under the impression that one of the greatest reforms that would emanate from the present popular Government will be the better advancement of this department both financially and effectively to reduce the many drawbacks and the tyranny that the poor depressed classes were subjected to by the over-scrupulous high-caste Hindus and the greedy zamindars. To my surprise now I find that the hon. Members who have now come forward to lay the shears to this most important and useful department take no consideration whatever for the reason of its existence and the good work it has done now under the staff. At present, we see only some three districts in the presidency reaping the benefit of this department and we also find that the three assistant commissioners have in their hands full work and in fact require more assistance. To set forth a motion to abolish these appointments in my opinion is to reduce the department to its minimum usefulness. Deputy tahsildars and revenue inspectors, I must say, are men of not very high standing in the eyes of rich zamindars and landholders, and I fear the prestige and the importance they carry in their respective villages and zamins will cast a mighty influence over these subordinates and make them humble servants of these village dignitaries rather than the faithful servants of Government to work for the amelioration of the depressed classes. We have found that formerly the welfare of the depressed classes were delegated

[Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai]

[25th March 1922]

to the Collectors of the district and their subordinate officers, but the multifarious duties these officers had to attend to, gave them very little opportunities to devote their attention to the special work of rescuing the poor depressed classes from the enormity and tyranny of their employers and the caste prejudice which made them to be treated more as beasts than human beings.

"I dare say that all the members are aware that the leading people of the depressed classes are holding conferences and meetings in several parts of the Presidency passing resolutions for the consideration of the Government and the members of this House against the abolition of the Labour Commissioner's Department or any reduction in its establishment and staff, and I would respectfully submit that the hon. Members in putting forth motions will give due consideration and weight to this resolution. Lastly, Sir, if the House were to go on cutting down the allotments like this, I may be pardoned for saying that this House will be only overdoing its functions."

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR:—"Mr. President, somehow my name came before this House and therefore I have to say a few words on this motion. I was asked by Mr. Mudaliyar to go to the Collector's bungalow to meet Mr. Paddison, Commissioner of Labour. Accordingly I went there and met Mr. Paddison. After several questions being put to and answered by Mr. Mudaliyar, finally Mr. Paddison asked me whether I knew anything about the matters contained in the petition. I said I only knew one thing and that was that out of the grant made for purchase of lands for the depressed classes to Ukkadai Rao Bahadur Annaswami Thevar, lands were purchased for some of the Christian people who had money to fall back upon. I asked Mr. Thevar to represent these facts to the Collector. I do not know his decision. Mr. Bhavanandam Pillai himself admitted that 22 persons had been proved that they were not fit for this grant and that already 15 persons had been withdrawn from this. This substantiates what I said before.

"With regard to Mr. Mudaliyar's affidavit I should say that I have come into contact with persons who are prepared to put in affidavits to prove that their statements are true. The hon. Member Mr. Tapikachala Chettiyar has brought in a motion on this subject and I have also tabled a similar motion for the same purpose. Somehow or other those motions have not come up. Now my humble impression is that this work can be done without any prejudice to the depressed classes by the Collectors or by some other agency. These commissioners are superfluous men and their work can be done by other officers who have time to bestow their attention on these people."

Mr. G. VANDANAM:—"Sir, coming as I do from a Telugu district, I have different views on the Labour Department from those expressed by hon. Members who have spoken before me. The hon. the Law Member made us understand that after 30 years of patient experimental work they have come to the conclusion that Panchamas have need of a separate protector to develop their interests. I am very thankful to the hon. the Law Member and to the Government for giving us a protector. But they are violating his work by heaping upon the Labour Commissioner a variety of duties which are of no advantage to the depressed classes. If the intention of the Government is to do good to the depressed classes, the Labour Commissioner ought to have different duties from what he has been doing. The hon. the Law

25th March 1922]

[Mr. G. Vandanam]

Member has given us a catalogue of duties which did not at all affect the interests of the depressed classes. Therefore, if the Government have any idea of doing good to the depressed classes, the first thing they have to do is to relieve the Labour Commissioner of duties other than those of protector of the depressed classes. If I had my own way, I would like to suggest to the Government that instead of having a very costly machinery and excluding the Telugu country from the benefit of the protector of depressed classes, what they should do is to have a number of well-paid agencies to do the work in all districts of the Presidency at the same time so that all the members of the depressed classes may reap the advantages. So far as the present protector of depressed classes is concerned, he is very well known in the Tamil country and in Madras. In the Gōdāvari district even his name is hardly known. If the protector of depressed classes is to confer any benefit upon the people it would be this. It is a pity that there is no standing committee of the House to advise the Labour Commissioner about the interests of the depressed classes. We have a number of committees to advise on this and on that. But on such an important question as the protection of the depressed classes there is no committee at all and there is no one to advise the Labour Commissioner as to the work he has been doing. The impression left in the minds of people of my parts is that he is in Madras solely working for the Tamil country. Therefore, if the Labour department is to justify its existence it must do some work for the Telugu country also. Much money is being spent at present in the name of the amelioration of the depressed classes. The Labour Commissioner has to answer so many international labour problems. It is true that he has to settle labour disputes in Madras and other places and it is true that he has to look after the factories and other things. But should he not look after the welfare of the Panchamas in the Telugu country? He has not been doing this. So, my point is that instead of having such a costly machinery and instead of spending so much money on the establishment, upon the assistants and upon this person and that person, it is better to have an honorary agency to go and examine into the condition of the depressed classes, to suggest methods for their improvement and bring them before the Government for solution. If this is not done, I am afraid the condition of the depressed classes can in no way be ameliorated."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, the speech of the last speaker has only added more force to what I said. I said that if the present policy is to be continued we ought to have at least one officer for each district and a number of assistants under him if his work is to be satisfactory. That was the reason why I opposed the present policy. I also said that we have not got funds enough to make provision for anything like an establishment to carry out that policy for the improvement of the depressed classes. I said that no large part of the 5 or 6 lakhs now provided should be spent on establishments and that we should try to get the work done by other agencies. There should be a staff provided in the headquarters for co-ordinating the work to be done for these depressed classes and for making a settled programme of work for these people and also for watching if that programme is carried out. That was what I proposed and it was in view of that policy that I moved for this omission. The last speaker has only confirmed me in my view. I now respectfully ask the Council to take this view and accept the motion.

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

"As regards what was said by the hon. the Law Member and others about the work of the men at present employed in the department I have absolutely nothing to say. My proposal has nothing to do with the present men or the work they are doing. It is based on a question of policy and with that view alone I press this motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, it looks as if one district is jealous of another. The intention of the Government was to undertake the special work in at least eight districts where the depressed classes population was the largest. We started work in three districts. We wanted to have special agencies at Guntur, Kistna and another district."

Mr. G. VANDANAM :—"Of the eight districts, in how many taluks are there agencies for the protection of the depressed classes?"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I cannot make any distinction between Tamil, Telugu, or any other country. All that we can do and are anxious to do is to help as large a number of depressed classes as we can reach, to whatever district they may belong, whether Tamil, Telugu, or Kanarese. I believe there are some in Malabar, some in South Kanara, some in Telugu, and some in Tamil districts. That is not the point. However, I am making this offer to the House; it has been found, or rather that is the opinion of experienced officers, that this work cannot be done by the ordinary Revenue Divisional staff, because we are not in a position to give a special agency in every district. One hon. Member proposes to abolish all the agencies in all districts. That is a very curious position."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"It is not my proposal to abolish all agencies in all districts. I said in my speech that we should have some agencies for the operation of the programme and then wherever there is work specially to be done we will have to create agencies for three months or six months. That is what I proposed."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I believe all sorts of methods have been tried, but to no purpose. I am willing that this work should be undertaken, for instance in the Guntur district by the Collector and revenue divisional officers. I am also willing to try the experiment in Chingleput, the work being done by the same agency in one taluk of the Chingleput district, along with special agencies in other taluks. In South Kanara, where there is a well organized mission society let the ordinary staff undertake this work. If necessary, I shall provide funds for them to do the work. We shall see whether that work has succeeded and benefited the depressed classes to any extent. If at the end of the year you find that the ordinary revenue staff is able to do that work without the aid of a special agency, or is able to do that work as well as the special agency work, by all means let us abolish the special agency. Let us not prejudge by *a priori* reasoning, but let us have some practical experience. I have only one thing to say and that is with regard to the particular village mentioned by Mr. Vandayar in his speech. I understand from the Labour Commissioner that the case is still being inquired into."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I should like to make a few observations more or less in support of what my friend Mr. Vandanam said in connexion with the organization of the department. I do not wish to go into the complaints brought by him to the notice of this Council or to go into the report of the Labour Commissioner. However, the

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

papers have not been placed at the disposal of the House. If the hon. the Law Member wishes to refer to any allegations made in those papers, he should have placed them on the table of this House."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" They are not complete. As soon as they are complete I shall place them on the table of this House."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" My hon. Friend has no right to refer to anything which is not complete."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I am entitled to refer to them. With regard to the first petition, we had completed the inquiry. As regards the second which merely contains certain allegations, this is being inquired into."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I must repeat the view which I have expressed more than once."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask, Sir, why Mr. Paddison has given me no notice and whether he has personally examined all the persons mentioned in my petition? All my petitions are not mere paper. They are all supported by affidavits. May I know whether a regular inquiry has been made? What I find is that his inspection lasted only for two hours in a village, and if this is so, I challenge the hon. the Law Member to make a regular inquiry and ascertain whether the facts and statements contained in my letter are true or not."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" There were two petitions presented to this House on the same day, one was presented to me earlier. With regard to the first petition, I found, after making inquiries, that the allegations made in it were inaccurate. With regard to the second petition, I found that it contained personal allegations against a particular officer working in a district, which do not really matter so far as the policy of the Government as regards this department is concerned. As to the second petition, I have got an answer from the officer who was attacked and on that reply inquiry will be made by the Labour Commissioner and due notice will be given to the interested parties. I really wonder how it has anything to do with the policy of the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I wish merely to make a suggestion in regard to some of the statements made by way of reply by the hon. the Law Member. If he wants to refer to any portion of the report, the regular procedure to be adopted by him would be to print that portion and place copies of that statement on the table of the House, so that we may be in a position to see what that report is and what those allegations are. Instead of doing that, my hon. Friend wishes merely to make an offer by saying 'I am quite willing to place this report at the disposal of any hon. Member that may want it'."

1 p.m.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" If I refer to any portion of any report, I must be prepared to lay it on the table of the House. That is the rule, and I say I am prepared to lay it on the table. It does not mean that I should distribute copies to all hon. Members whether they want to see it or not."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I shall argue this matter by means of a regular resolution at a later stage. That is all I can now say and I do not want to waste the time of the House."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Will the hon. Member be entitled to argue a point of order by a resolution, Sir ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If he brings forward a resolution on the subject, then that will be decided. "

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I was acting in accordance with the ruling of the President. If I made a mistake, I entirely apologise to you, Sir. "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I shall now go into the merits of this question for a few minutes with your permission. The whole point raised is, what should be the organization of this department. Three assistant labour commissioners have been appointed in this new department, and the whole question is whether this reorganization is the best in the interests of the depressed classes and for the settlement of labour questions. My friend Mr. Vandanam has already said that in the interests of the depressed classes it would be better to separate that portion of the work relating to their amelioration from that relating to the settlement of labour questions. Hon. Members are aware that there are always conflicting interests, of wage earners as against capitalists, and if anybody who is interested in the welfare of the depressed classes wishes to have the sympathy of all classes it is not by mixing up questions of labour, questions of wages, and the various questions in which capitalists come into conflict with agriculturists. Therefore the proposition that these things should be kept separate is a perfectly sound one. The reason why such an organization fails in the districts is the mixing up of these two classes of work, and if the same individual does both the classes of work, it may probably be to the detriment of the depressed classes themselves who are proposed to be benefited by these operations. Therefore, it seems to me, Sir, that the best way, so far as I can see—and I venture to put forward this suggestion for the consideration of hon. Members, the hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar and the Labour Commissioner—is to see whether they could take advantage of the existing staff in the districts, the existing depressed classes societies which exist in many places, and whether the Government should depute some officer in the district itself—it may be a deputy tahsildar or some other officer of that grade—to continue to bring to the front various questions relating to the amelioration of these depressed classes, the question relating to the acquisition of house-sites, the question of the disposal of lands. Then I ask my hon. Friend why the Revenue Department refuses to do this work on behalf of the depressed classes? My hon. Friend was eloquent in their praise, and whenever a single statement is made against any officer, almost all of my hon. Friends opposite get up and stand up for every one of them. Now, I ask him why they do not see that their own officials do their work sufficiently well? Here is the Commissioner of Labour who goes to all the districts and tells them, ' Look here, these lands have to be acquired . . . ' "

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I would at once beg permission, Sir, to correct a word. It is not a question of refusal, but it is a question of ability to do work over and above their ordinary heavy duties. "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I call it passive resistance and nothing but passive resistance. I myself know of a great many complaints with reference to land acquisition. The things are done in

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

such a leisurely fashion, and I think I must charge my hon. Friend who is in charge of this department that if he wishes to put a little more life and a little more zest into the Revenue Department he ought to see that he receives a periodical return of the land acquisition cases which have been delayed for more than three months."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Such returns do exist in every district which is properly administered and regularly scrutinized. I think the return is a half-yearly one."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"If, notwithstanding all these returns, these difficulties are not rectified, I think something is seriously wrong somewhere. I think it is time enough that my hon. Friend should see that these officials do their work with reference to land acquisition more promptly and efficiently."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, may I take up that challenge as regards the ability, or, as my hon. Colleague has put it, the possibility, of this work being done by revenue officers with reference to my own personal experience in the district of Chingleput? The question of the amelioration of the condition of the backward classes was taken up in that district many years ago by a missionary whose name we have all learned to revere, the Rev. Mr. Andrew, and he spent a great deal of time and trouble upon the matter, one of the results of which is the settlement at Melrosapuram. Meanwhile certain revenue officers had also taken it up, including Mr. Mullaly and Mr. Tremenheere, who wrote a great report on the system of practical slavery existing in that district. The matter went up to the Board of Revenue and Government, and when their orders were issued, Sir James Thomson, who at that time (1894) was Collector of the district, issued instructions with a view to seeing that they were given effect to, especially in the matter of the provision of land for the lower castes. When I went to that district in 1912, I made inquiries for these orders and found some difficulty even in discovering them. When I did so, I found that the whole scheme had been allowed to fall into abeyance, because the revenue officials had not—"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I ask the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter whether he pursued his inquiries further and found out who was responsible for all these things done by Mr. Trevelyan and other gentlemen mentioned not being carried out? Is it the Government or the Board of Revenue or is it the district officer?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"If the hon. Member had let me finish what I was saying I would have told him just what had happened. I pursued these orders, which I revived, and I set to work to discover how much land had been assigned to the lower castes. I will give one instance of the results. In that case, a piece of land had been assigned to a low caste man; but the village officer—whom certain members of the Council are fond of representing as the one essential official, the person upon whom the whole structure of Government rests—this officer had made out a joint patta for the land belonging to the Adi-Dravida and for some adjacent land belonging to a caste man. The caste man had failed to pay his share of the kist. The whole of the joint patta holding was brought to sale for arrears and the Adi-Dravida, who knew nothing whatever about his neighbour's land, was

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[25th March 1922]

ejected from his piece of land for his neighbour's default. I offer this to the Council as a sample of the results that occur when we leave matters entirely to revenue officials over whom there are not sufficient superior officers to exercise the exact and efficient supervision which is required. I am therefore entirely in agreement with Mr. Vandanam's suggestion that the two sets of officers should be kept separate. The duties of specialist officers such as these have been defined elsewhere, namely, to induce Collectors to distribute their neglect; that is to say, the revenue officers have so many duties imposed upon them that they must neglect some and the function of each specialist officer is to see that whatever else they have to neglect, his department is attended to."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—"I thought the Collector has been relieved of the income-tax work and some other branch of work, and is also likely to be relieved of the treasury work. I think the Collector can very well undertake to do this work, and if the Collectors are not properly doing it, the Government can insist on their doing it."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The Collector has not yet been relieved of work in connexion with income-tax and he never did hold charge of the treasury. The only thing that he has been relieved of is the local fund work. In place of that he is having new duties imposed upon him every day. I think it is quite out of the question that he should take on those of the specialist department."

"At the same time, may I say that personally (I am not speaking for the Government) I am and have always been entirely in agreement with the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao when he says that the function of the amelioration of the depressed classes and those in connexion with labour disputes should be separated. The only difficulty about separating them in the case of the Labour Commissioner is that we cannot afford two officers. This objection, however, does not apply to the case of the officers in the districts. For, so far as I am aware, none of these officers have yet been required to intervene in industrial disputes. In other words, their duties have been confined to work for the amelioration of the backward classes."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, the Puliantope affair and other occurrences referred to were very unfortunate incidents in the history of the department of Labour Commissioner. But, Sir, a high compliment ought to be paid to Mr. Moir, the Labour Commissioner for the untiring devotion with which he worked in connexion with the amelioration of the depressed classes. I had the fortune to go about with him and I really admire his zeal. If the Council feels that the three assistant labour commissioners should go, I request the Government to have honorary assistant labour commissioners appointed as far as possible from the depressed classes themselves. Sir, in support of my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar I request the Labour Commissioner to seek the grievances of the depressed classes, and not to wait till petitions are received from them. If they can take care of themselves, why should there be any protection at all for them?"

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—"Sir, if I rise now, it is more to pour oil on troubled waters (laughter) than anything else. There is an impression, Sir, that the party in power is against the depressed classes, but I should like to correct that idea and say that the party in power is not against the depressed

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

classes (hear, hear). Their idea is only to effect retrenchment. They think that more money is spent on the establishment than on the amelioration of the depressed classes. Mr. Vandanam has said that if honorary workers are appointed, the work would be done better and cheaper, but I am afraid Mr. Vandanam has not understood human nature well. The work amongst the depressed classes is one that demands much patience and tact and I am sure no honorary man would undertake to do that work. Besides, this is a work that must carry along with it some authority and power. I am sure if honorary men are appointed, they would be quite useless in this matter of uplifting the depressed classes."

Mr. G. VANDANAM:—"I said that, in the absence of paid men, honorary workers may be appointed. You cannot have paid men until honorary workers do some work."

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—"Sir, I would therefore appeal to my friends here not to be so very stringent on the money that is spent on the depressed classes at the present juncture. We are only starting the work, and the work is in the initial stages and there are many districts where this work must be carried on and many districts are awaiting the advent of these officers who would uplift and help the depressed classes. I would appeal to the hon. Mover not to press this motion, but allow that the money allotted for this department for this year is passed. There was the question, Sir, of the separation of the Labour Department from its other branch of work. This is a very knotty problem, but from the common-sense point of view as labour is recruited mostly from the depressed classes, I do not see why there should be a separation of these two branches at the present time."

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"Sir, I rise to oppose the motion before the House. The net result of accepting it will be to paralyze the work of the speedy uplift of the depressed classes in the Presidency. In this connexion, Sir, I beg your permission to read out a resolution with reference to the Labour Department that was passed at the second conference of the Arundhatias whom I have the honour to represent in this Council, on the 19th instant, under the presidency of the Raja Sahib of Pithapuram. The resolution runs as follows:—

1-15 p.m. '3. (a) This conference fully appreciates the programme laid out by the Labour Department of the Government of Madras for the uplift of the depressed classes.

(b) It is emphatically of opinion that a special agency is absolutely necessary to give speedy effect to the programme.

(c) This conference further strongly urges that not only should the department be continued but should also be strengthened so as to extend its operations to all the districts of the Presidency.

(d) If for any reason the department cannot be strengthened by means of paid officials this conference prays that honorary officers may be drafted in on the lines of honorary assistant registrars of the co-operative societies.'

"From this it will be seen, Sir, that in the opinion of my community a special department is absolutely necessary for giving speedy effect to the programme of the Labour Department with reference to the depressed classes.

"This motion is supported among others on grounds of economy. Every possible reduction has now got to be made on account of the very unsatisfactory state of our finances. I have no objection to any prevention of waste

[Mr. L. C. Guruswami]

[25th March 1922]

and to the substitution of a cheaper agency for a costly one. I fully realize that in these days of financial stringency the existence of this office is a burden on the tax-payer. But at the same time it should be remembered that the office itself is a necessary burden. Ever since the establishment of this office the depressed classes have been cared for by the Labour Commissioner in a manner that has given satisfaction to them. And they are much better off and more contented than they were before the institution of this office. So let us not practise false economy, let us not refuse funds for essential and useful services which raise the moral and material condition of the masses of whom the depressed classes form a large part occupying a position which is disgraceful to humanity. It has been suggested that a separate department is unnecessary for looking after the depressed classes and that the Revenue Department could well do it. Sir, I beg to differ emphatically from this view. Before the institution of this office some such thing was no doubt in existence. But such an arrangement was not satisfactory and nothing practical was achieved for the following reasons: The Revenue Department have multifarious duties to attend to and as such they have very little time to look after the needs of the depressed classes. Secondly, some of the officers themselves in the department may not be in full sympathy with this question and in that case the depressed classes will be completely neglected. Thirdly, even if the officers have sympathy and good will towards them they are practically unable to do much for them owing to the influential and formidable opposition of the landlords and ryots. Lastly, the revenue officers generally deal with all these matters through their subordinates who will surely face all the difficulties I have just now mentioned. From this it is clear that the old system of leaving the matter in the hands of the Revenue Department was a failure and consequently the Government established this office in 1919. If you like you are quite welcome to reform or reorganize the Labour Department or change its name or personnel. But a special agency there must exist for carrying out the programme that has already been chalked out for the uplift of the depressed classes.

"Indeed, Sir, not only do I want the present special agency to be retained in fact, but that it should be considerably strengthened so as to extend its operations to all the districts of the Presidency. It was the present financial stringency that prevented me to press for the enlargement of the special department. Under these circumstances the abolition of even these three assistant commissioners would be extremely undesirable. I therefore oppose the motion."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, my friend Mr. Palmer very rightly referred to the fact that we have been contributing in a larger measure for the depressed classes from year to year. I have figures taken from the budget book which show that in the year 1920-21 loans were made to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for the Panchamas to the extent of Rs. 1,04,500. Recoveries were made to the extent of Rs. 73,000 and that left a balance of Rs. 30,000. Last year there was an allotment of Rs. 3,00,000 which when added to the previous year's balance comes to Rs. 3,30,000. There was again a recovery of Rs. 15,000 only. And even in this year of financial stringency there is an allotment of Rs. 3,15,000. This leaves a total unrecovered amount of Rs. 6,40,000. This is so far as co-operative societies for the purpose of

25th March 1922]

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

acquiring sites are concerned. For the year 1920-21 the budget allotment for the general purposes of Labour Department was Rs. 2·84 lakhs and in the year 1921-22 the budget estimate was Rs. 4·74 lakhs and the revised estimate was Rs. 5·71 lakhs and this year we have budgeted for Rs. 6·62 lakhs. Sir, these figures disprove any allegations that it is intended to reduce the allotments for the depressed classes or that they are not being treated properly or sympathetically.

“The hon. the Finance Member has referred to very many respected names in ancient times who were unsuccessful in Chingleput in their efforts to obtain land for Panchamas. May I point out that they had not the benefit of a Labour Department, money allotments, establishment, etc., which are available at the present day? May I remind him of the existence in the present day of another very distinguished officer in that district, an officer who has been specially selected for his tact and ability to deal with a difficult situation in another quarter of this Presidency? Is it not a fact that Mr. Vernon has made a very different report on the work of the Labour Department as it is at present constituted with regard to all its activities whether for good or for evil? Contemporaneously with the disturbances which were going on in the mill area here, in certain villages in the Chingleput district under the directions of the assistant commissioner of labour sites were selected for acquisition contrary to the District Collector's recommendations and which tended to create danger to the peace and tranquility of the district and Mr. Vernon had to place special police to guard the area. Particularly in a place called Mangadu, 170 flimsy huts were put up by the Adi-Dravidas who had come from various neighbouring villages on the village grazing ground. The several huts grew up like the prophet's gourd in one night and with the greatest difficulty the District Collector was able to keep the peace of the district and he had also to address the Government on the subject. My friend Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar was twitted by the hon. the Law Member with presenting in the petition he submitted allegations which had not been proved. That is with reference to Tanjore. I am not concerned with that. But so far as the Chingleput district is concerned there have been various irregularities if not under the very auspices at least under the encouragement of the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, and this formed the subject matter of correspondence between the Collector and the Labour department if not with the Government direct. Then it was that Mr. Vernon also wrote to Mr. M. C. Raja inquiring if the Adi-Dravidas in acting as they did in Chingleput district were being advised by him. Then Mr. Vernon pointed out the danger of officers dealing directly in the name of the Labour Commissioner and acting independently of the officers like the District Collector or the Divisional Officer, and without consulting them as to whether proposals for acquisition or grant of site would cause any breach of the peace or inconvenience to the other people. I believe —”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TUDHUNTER:—“May I say that I mentioned that the Collector and his officers have no time to attend to this work? I really do not see what they have to do with the present thing.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“Here is an organization, here is a protector of the depressed classes and more than that a Government Member and all of them have —”

[25th March 1922]

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" Is the hon. Member proposing to destroy the organization ? "

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I do say that it shall not be destroyed, but that it shall be re-organized with a view to economy, efficiency and expediency. We shall not grudge to allow even 10 lakhs for their benefit, but we shall still economise as much as possible the expenditure on the establishment and do what is conducive to the best interests of the country. Sir, there are already disintegrating influences at work in all mufassal stations. There is the work of the non-co-operator. Add to this the work of the Assistant Commissioner of Labour who, in the name of the Commissioner, comes into the district and makes use of his powers independently of the District Collector and others who are responsible for the peace of the locality without trying to find out whether his proposals could be carried out without inconvenience to the rest of the citizens, without caring to ascertain whether his schemes could be carried out in a manner calculated to give little irritation to the rest of the people. An officer working independently of the Collector or the Divisional officer gives the impression to the depressed classes that their protector lives outside the district and that they need not care for their caste neighbours or the district officers. Would this not lead to ill-feeling and is that conducive to the good administration of the country ? I do not seek to destroy the fabric, Sir, I only wish to destroy that which makes for mischief."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" May I say just one word, Sir ? I am not going into the merits of the controversy between them. The instructions from the Labour Commissioner were that they should take every opportunity to seek their (Collectors') assistance and advice and keep the Collectors thoroughly informed of the progress of work and of the questions and problems that arise from time to time."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I am only concerned with what is actually being done and not with the instructions that are given. More often the instructions are altogether different from what actually takes place. On these grounds I support the motion. There may be another organization making use of the district agency and of the special tahsildar and the Revenue department who are still retained and against whom there is no proposal for cutting down. Mr. Vernon has expressed it emphatically that they can do this work with necessary instructions as to policy from the protector of the depressed classes but working under his orders."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" Mr. President, I have been very much at a disadvantage during this discussion : because, on the first motion which was merely a motion that a particular post should be abolished, various questions of organization and policy and past events with which I myself was incidentally connected and took some share were discussed. I was then prevented by a motion for closure from speaking on that motion and from saying anything with reference to the general questions which had been raised. We now have another motion ostensibly on a particular part of the organization of the Labour Department but on which general questions have been raised ; and apparently it is the only opportunity when I am likely to have to say anything on the general question. If I am permitted to do so I must be thankful to you, Sir, for any latitude that you may give me, such as has been given to other members of the House."

25th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

“ I will, however, try as far as I can to confine myself to this question of Assistant Commissioners. I may say that their abolition is by 1-30 p.m.

no means such a trivial matter as Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar has attempted to maintain. Regarding the whole of this question and the work which is being done for the depressed classes, the House has already been told for how long a time measures for the benefit of the depressed classes had been cogitated by Members of the Government and by other officers who have been responsible for dealing with this question. The measures regarding district organization which after much thought and consideration were put forward were given effect to as the deliberate decision of the Government in order to redeem long due pledges to the depressed classes. It was in fulfilment of these pledges these district organizations were entrusted with the duty of looking after their interests. It was further not intended when this organization was started that the Assistant Commissioner should be confined to three districts only. Two years ago, a proposal was put forward for expanding that system to eight districts, and it was hoped that eventually there would be a similar organization in every district in the Presidency in charge of the duty of spending the funds which this Council provides for the betterment of the depressed classes, for expanding their education and for meeting their other wants. If it had not been for the financial situation, to the necessities of which the Labour Department as other departments has had to bow, the proposals for district staffs in connexion with this object, before this Council would have been very much greater than they are. It is now, however, proposed, while maintaining the allotment under loans or under special grants for the depressed classes, to wipe out by a stroke of the pen the whole organization on which the spending of those sums depends. Now, what has been offered to the depressed classes in the place of this organization? Another enquiry. The matter has been under enquiry for thirty years one way or the other, and a definite and particular enquiry, as the hon. the Finance Member told the House, was made five years ago, and the whole of this is now sought to be thrown into the melting pot. Are the depressed classes to wait for another five years, for another enquiry and for another report? Some hon. Members have previously—”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ There is no proposal for the appointment of any committee of enquiry. The only proposal was that the Commissioner here should make some proposals, the working out of those proposals being left to the district officers. There are no proposals for appointing a committee or making an enquiry.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ I certainly distinctly remember one hon. Member—I cannot remember who it was—saying that this matter should be enquired into again and a fresh policy devised for carrying out our purpose. That is what is proposed to be offered to the depressed classes in place of the organization which we entrusted with the work of the expansion of the depressed classes.

“ Mr. Ramachandra Rao offered them a return of the lands which have not been assigned to them. Let me answer by saying, ‘ Is this what the House proposes to give to those waiting millions—for they are literally millions—who have been waiting and waiting for months to know what the decision of this House is going to be with reference to their future? ’ ”

[25th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I ask the hon. Member as to what is exactly the statement that he refers to as having been made by me?"

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"A return was offered to them with reference to grants available for assignation."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I did not offer that return to the depressed classes but to the hon. Members opposite. I have never intended to say that the depressed classes should suffer anything in any slightest degree; but, on the other hand, all the land that is available should be given to them, and every effort should be made to ameliorate their position. I referred to the return simply for the purpose of showing the want of diligence on the part of Government officers in working the acquisition. If necessary, the return may be presented to the hon. Member Mr. Moir or to the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, and not to the depressed classes."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"I am quite unmoved by that explanation for there is little comfort for the depressed classes in the hon. Member's further statement."

"Now two things have been urged with reference to these special establishments: one is that they do no work, the other that they have done too much. If they have done nothing, what is the meaning of this petition submitted to the House protesting saying that they have done too much. Their fault is not that they have done too little, but that they have done too much. It is the sincerity and the success of their efforts to promote the interest of the depressed classes that has roused against them the manifold forces of reaction and obscurantism. It is also said, 'Why not abolish the staff and tell the Collectors that in future they are to do this work?' I think it has been sufficiently explained to the Council that there are reasons owing to which Collectors have failed to secure such progress as could be desired."

"I was astonished to hear one hon. Member apparently refer to the Chingleput district as an example of what might be done under this proposed system. I may admit that in the Chingleput district even with a special staff at command and an Assistant Commissioner, the Labour Department's success has fallen far short of its efforts. But if the Chingleput district is an example of what can be done by the ordinary revenue staff, why is it that much has not been done? Of course, I do not blame any one for it, for one knows how true it is that the ordinary revenue establishment cannot also attend to these special duties. During the last twelve months, although 18,000 acres of land have been reserved for the depressed classes, why is it that the revenue staff was not able to assign an acre of land to a single man?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I ask Mr. Moir to suggest the answer to that question himself?"

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"By all means, if the House thinks that the measures taken on behalf of the depressed classes could be improved, let fresh measures be suggested. We have now at the head of the Labour department one of the most experienced and open-minded officers in the service. If suggestions can be made to improve things, I feel sure that they will receive his most anxious consideration. But surely it is unfair to him to

25th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

make mere casual suggestions, to say that possibly new methods could be tried, and without consideration of the problems and of the manifold issues which they involve, while vaguely suggesting that new measures could be taken, by your votes to make it impossible for him to carry on the existing system until a new one has been devised.

"I may say one word more. Is it not advisable for this House in this discussion to bear in mind the necessities and demands of the depressed classes themselves? They want no further investigation of their needs and no new systems. They merely ask that they should be improved. During the whole time I was Commissioner of Labour I was flooded with incessant appeals from the depressed classes of every district that this organization which they saw was doing such good work in districts like Godavari and Tanjore should be extended to the districts in which they were themselves living. May I further say—"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I may just ask whether special assistance may not be given to the Collector solely for this kind of work and if the district work of the depressed classes could not be thus better done and all these troubles avoided."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"As an administrative measure, I do not see where economy will come in and am not prepared to say whether it will work better. It is one of those administrative questions which no one would be prepared to answer at a moment's notice. But surely it is an evidence of the premature discussion of such questions, and it is unfair that random suggestions should be put forward in connexion with such a very important matter as the welfare of the depressed classes, and the Government urged to try them. May I add, further, that it is those Collectors who are most anxious to do something for the benefit of the depressed classes in their districts who have specially asked whether it would not be possible to extend this organisation into the districts over which they preside? I do hope that this House will realise that this motion goes far beyond the mere question of saving something like Rs. 17,000 out of the sum which has been provided for the establishment. As I have said, there are millions waiting outside this House, waiting to know what the decision of this House will be and wishing to know finally whether, when a few years ago these reforms were under discussion, they were justified or not in anticipating their results with the greatest misgivings."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"Sir, I thank my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar for bringing once more my name into the discussion. He very kindly referred to my name and said that Mr. Vernon had written to me a letter. Sir, I did not have any close conference with Mr. Vernon. All that I knew was that Mr. Vernon wrote me a letter and I answered him. But my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar seems to know more of Mr. Vernon, his willingness to take up this work, and so on. I do not know all that. We are for a special agency for carrying on this work. My friend Mr. Vandanam said that no ameliorative work was being carried on in most of the Telugu districts. It is because a Council like this has not given sufficient funds to carry on work in all the districts. If in a democratic Council like this—"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I think a Council like this cannot increase any allotment of its own accord and proposals for

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

increase will have to come from the Government in the first instance. It is unfortunate therefore that we cannot propose any increase in the allotment."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I think the members of the Finance Committee represent us and also represent the views of the Finance Committee. What I was given to understand was that the Labour Department sent in proposals for the extension of the work. The hon. the Finance Member also has said in the memorandum which he read the other day that he cried halt to a certain extension of work in regard to the depressed classes. So I say, Sir, that the Council did not vote for more money to carry on work in other districts."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"May I point out that even with all the retrenchment in the air a sum of Rs. 1.60 lakhs has been set apart for the reclamation of the condition of the Kallars, whereas it formed a part of the general allotment of Rs. 2 lakhs for all the criminal tribes previously?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I point out with reference to that that the rest of that general allotment is gone?"

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I was not holding any conference with the Labour Commissioner to know all those details. What I know, I say. I know he has sent up proposals for additional districts and the money was not granted."

"Sir, some of the hon. Members were of opinion that this work could be left to the revenue officers in the districts. I should like to call attention to the extract which the hon. the Law Member read from that Government Order published by the Board of Revenue some years back. This experiment was tried for over three or four decades and was found to be unsuccessful. My community has been agitating for a special agency. As my hon. Friend Mr. Vandanam has said, by means of resolutions passed at various conferences the Telugu districts have asked for a special agency. And in one of the conferences, in that held at Amalapuram, one of my hon. Friends Diwan Bahadur K. Venkataratnam Nayudu has presided and, I believe, a Minister was also present. All that I would like to say, Sir, is that this work is of a special kind and requires a special training. Moreover, Sir, one reason why Mr. Atulanandam got a bad name in Tanjore was, if I understand it correctly, that he was trying to pull down the slavery of my community. Slavery is existing, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not want to interrupt the debate which is going on with a considerable amount of latitude; but if we are going to deal with slavery in Tanjore just now, I fear this debate will be greatly protracted."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"All that I want to drive at is that a man of sufficiently high status is required to do this work. You know, Sir, in the mufassal parts the influence of the local magnates overrides the influence of the petty officials and therefore if the officials appointed to do this work there are of sufficiently high standing, say of the grade of a deputy collector, of a gazetted officer, such people alone can acquire land according to the Land Acquisition Act, and I think, Sir, the work will be carried on successfully. On the other hand, if the work is to be left in the hands of the deputy tahsildar or the revenue inspector who is only a reporting officer, he will have no power at all for acquiring sites. All that he will do is he will go to

25th March 1922]

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

the spot and write a report and send it to the office. The deputy tahsildar cannot send a communication direct to the Collector. He must send it to the office. The sarishtadar is in the office and he puts a note and sends it to the Collector. He may say the deputy tahsildar reports so and so. We cannot accept this. The paper should be sent to the revenue district officers for further investigation. You know, Sir, what that means. In this connexion I should like to point out certain incidents that took place in the South Arcot district during the time of Mr. Guppy. I have got the proceedings here, Sir. Swami Sahajananda applied for the acquisition of some lands in South Arcot. Of course, the Revenue Department put in a number of obstacles in the way of the acquisition. But the Swami persisted in it and the sympathetic Collector went and inspected the spot, and here is his statement. He says: 'I therefore resolved to inspect the land and did so. All reports in the file are misleading. More correct reports are found in another file not shown to me before inspection. The northern portion is the highest and is no use for storing water. The middle portion is low and is required for draining off surplus water of Kunnamangalam tank. South of this is the bund on which there is an Ayyanar temple. South of the bund is a swamp along the western margin of which runs an irrigation channel to take Kunnamangalam tank to wet fields.' The notes later on read: 'The Mirasdar, Mr. V. Velayudam Pillai, is the chief opponent of the alienation. Knowing that I inspected the land, he gave up the contention that the northern portion is required for water spread and says that it is required for village site. The contentions of persons who offer contradictory arguments of this kind are not worth anything.' So, Sir, you will find what sort of support the report of the deputy tahsildar is likely to give to my people and what support they are likely to get from the Revenue department. And further, Sir, as regards the Chingleput district, you remember that in the budget speech, I spoke something about Mr. Vernon. At a conference in Chingleput district my people have passed a resolution in which they say—

'That this Conference resolves that in the interests of the community it is desirable and necessary that Mr. A. Doraiswami Mudaliyar, Deputy Collector and Personal Assistant to the Collector of Chingleput, should be immediately transferred from the district, since there is reason to fear that he exerts his influence against the progress and prosperity of the depressed classes in that district.'

"My people in that district come and say that because there is Mr. Duraiswami Mudaliyar as personal assistant they are not able to get anything from the Collector. I am placing all these facts to show how people throw obstacles in the way of the progress of my community. Unless we have a special agency set apart there is no salvation for us; and to relegate us to the tender mercies of the revenue inspectors or the deputy tahsildars is the same as bringing on our destruction. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar said something about Mangadu. I should like to ask my hon. Friend who said that these people went there and put up huts in one night, whether he has seen my people also there and asked them what the matter was. If he had seen Adi-Dravidas and the mirasidars on opposite sides, then I would agree to whatever he says."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"That is the work of the district authority. I am only referring to the correspondence."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"I therefore say, Sir, that the hon. Member is saying all these things under instructions given to him by one side and that he has not seen these things. I have come here to represent a big community

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[25th March 1922]

and if we want to do efficient work in this Council, it is our duty that we should consider the interests of all the parties concerned and come to a conclusion instead of taking sides with one or the other."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the House long at this stage of the discussion. I only want to assure my Adi-Dravida friends that we are heart and soul with their cause."

Mr. M. C. RAJA:—"It is not the mere assurance that we want but actual work to be done."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, I refuse to believe that a gentleman merely because he belongs to that community should be made the dictator as to what should be done by the Legislative Council. Our sympathies are entirely with the progress of these classes and in this matter I am perfectly certain that where we differ is in regard to the machinery to be established for achieving the progress of these people. I suggested when the hon. Member, Mr. Moir, was speaking, whether a district agency at the head of which there will be an officer of the rank of a deputy tahsildar or a tahsildar acting as the personal assistant to the Collector would not meet the ends in view and also avoid friction. Sir, friction necessarily arises because we have two agencies without any connexion whatsoever with each other to deal with land acquisition. That seems to me to be the source of the trouble."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"May I say, Sir, that during the time I was the Commissioner of Labour, I had relations with the Collectors and in the case of the Collectors of all districts in the Presidency excepting one district which I need not specify, there was no tendency towards friction at all."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"When I talked of friction I was not thinking of friction between the officials but I was thinking of the kind of friction between the tahsildars and the people on the one side and the Adi-Dravida brethren on the other. I think an agency of this kind would probably work better. The matter requires investigation. It was said in previous years that the revenue department was not able to achieve much. The proposal now made differs from the previous practice in three very important respects. Firstly, there would be the protector of the depressed classes at Madras to co-ordinate the work of the districts, and reports would have to be sent to him as to what has been done on the orders that he had issued. Secondly, there would be a special staff—special not independent, I do not think special need mean independent in the district, working under the orders of the Collector which would be in charge of this work and under this department. Thirdly, there would also be definite appropriations earmarked for this purpose at the disposal of the Collector. So with these three safeguards the present administration may be re-organized. Above all, the functions of the Labour Commissioner and that of the protector of the depressed classes should be separated as they may sometimes be contradictory of each other and we should avoid all such troubles as now arise. If such a re-organization is effected we would be doing our best both by the Adi-Dravida and the general interest of the country at large."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"With reference to the speech of my hon. Friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, I shall examine the question of co-ordination of the special staff with the Collector. If I remember right even now, the proposals for acquisition of house-sites come

25th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

through the Collector and this is true at least so far as the Chingleput district is concerned. I am not quite sure with regard to other districts but I remember to have seen papers connected with acquisition coming through the Collector. I am quite ready to examine the question and that is all that I can say. It is not a question of economy. I am quite willing to see whether you can reorganize the district establishment so as to be more in touch with the Collectors with regard to this work. It was in this connexion that I was referring to the instructions given to the Assistant Labour Commissioners asking them to be in touch always with the Collectors before they make acquisitions and to take their advice and to report to them fully and not to do anything without consulting them. We have issued these instructions. 'If in particular instances it has not been followed there is the Labour Commissioner who would carefully go into every one of these matters.'

"I may say, Sir, with regard to the separation of the departments concerned, it was my desire as well as the desire of the Labour Commissioner that these should be separated. This year we are not able to work it out because there is no money for the purpose of separation."

2 p.m.

The motion was then put to the House and a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 26. Mr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 27. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. |
| 3. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 28. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 29. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 5. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etrajulu Nayudu. | 31. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 32. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 36. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. I. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 38. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampam. |
| 14. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 39. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 41. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 42. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 43. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 44. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 45. Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya P'uja. | 46. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 22. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | |
| 23. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | |
| 24. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | |
| 25. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Mr. E. Periyanyagam. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 13. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ull-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 16. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 17. Mr. A. T. Palmer |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 18. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 19. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 20. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 21. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. | 22. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| | 23. Rao Bahadur T. Numberamal Chetti. |

[25th March 1922]

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 5. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 6. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 3. „ M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 7. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharu. |
| 4. „ L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar. | 8. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| | 9. Rai Sahib E. M. C. Mascarenhas. |

The motion was carried, 46 members voting *for*, 23 *against* and 9 remaining *neutral*.

Motions 655 to 688.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The time of half a day allowed by His Excellency the Governor for the discussion on this grant having expired, the following motions 655 to 688 have now lapsed” :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

655. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

656. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for the duty allowance to three assistant commissioners*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

657. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

658. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

659. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

660. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.*

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

661. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 62,180 for salaries by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

662. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,000 for lump provision for temporary additional establishment.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

663. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 67,490 for establishment.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

664. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 20,000.*

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

665. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for conveyance allowance to the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

666. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for conveyance allowance to the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

667. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,25,000, the lump provision for free grants for the settlement of the depressed classes.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

668. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

669. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

670. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

671. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

672. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

673. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Re. 1.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

674. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

675. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000, provision for education charges of depressed classes.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

676. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

677. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 1,50,000.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

678. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 1,10,000.*

[25th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

679. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 33,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

680. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

681. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

682. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

683. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,164 for the officer and establishment for the Chentsus on the Nallamalais by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

684. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,326 for the settlement at Siddapuram, Kurnool, by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

685. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Commissioner of Labour and Industrial Settlement by Rs. 90,500.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

686. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Labour Commissioner by 1 lakh.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

687. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

688. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by 2 lakhs.*

The demand for 7.87 lakhs under Labour and allied departments, minus Rs. 21,380, being the deductions made by the House, was then put and carried and the grant was made.

IV

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon the PRESIDENT :—“ Before the House rises for lunch, I have to mention that the number of candidates nominated for election to the Public Accounts Committee is 13, while the number of seats to be filled up is 7. An election of 7 candidates, out of the 13, by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in the Council Chamber at 5-40 p.m. to-day.”

The House then adjourned for lunch at 2-5 p.m. and re-assembled at 3 p.m.

25th March 1922]

III—cont.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—cont.

DEMAND XXV—EXCHANGE.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 16·52 lakhs under Demand XXV—Exchange."

Motion 689.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

689. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,52,000 for Exchange by Rs. 100.*

"My object in moving this is merely to know why we in this presidency, who are not responsible for the exchange policy resulting in this loss, should bear this loss. From the statement made by the hon. the Finance Member when presenting the budget, I see we paid nothing last year and that there were some orders from the Government of India fixing some rate and saying that we in this presidency should pay according to that rate and that the loss should be borne from the coming year. I suppose it is not a votable or a non-votable item and I do not know what it is. I do not say anything at all one way or the other. I do not want to embarrass my hon. Friend, but I want him on behalf of this presidency to represent to the Government of India and the Secretary of State that we are not responsible for this loss and that we should not be debited with any of this. I would like to know what my hon. Friend himself thinks about the matter, but I do think, Sir, that it is one of those old maxims that those who have no control should not be asked to pay. In this particular instance we have no control whatever over the financial policy which has resulted, or which is likely to result in this loss. I would therefore make this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I am not quite sure if I have clearly understood my hon. Friend's motion, but as far as I can make out, it amounts to this, that because the Government of India have not been very successful in their currency policy so far as it relates to the matter of exchange, we are to demand of them that they shall arrange for us to transact business always on the basis of a 2s. rupee. If the hon. Member will give me any plausible arguments with which I can enforce that request when I go to Simla to discuss the question of the contribution, I shall be glad to consider them. But I am afraid at present I should be laughed out of court before I had stated his proposition."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, so far as I can recollect, I do not think that we have had this loss debited against us in any of the previous years. If that is a fact, it is a sufficient argument why we should not be burdened with this this time."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"If I may invite my friend's attention to paragraphs 166, 167 and 168 of the memorandum, he will find an explanation of the reason why this was not debited in the previous year. It amounts simply to this, that the Government of India had not fixed the rate. We are therefore bringing forward a supplementary estimate now that

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[25th March 1922]

they have fixed it. As regards the coming year, they have fixed the rate and that has enabled us to put it in the budget and not to ask for a supplementary grant at the end of the year."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Before I withdraw my motion, I would only say one word and that is that perhaps the Government of India were convinced before that they were responsible for the financial muddle which has resulted in this great loss and that that was the reason why they did not fix the rate hitherto and did not call upon Local Governments to make a contribution on the result of their transactions. But now they are clearly making an attempt to raise a debit against these provinces and I trust the hon. the Finance Member when he goes to Simla will make the best of the situation and try to get it withdrawn as early as possible."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I need hardly say, Sir, that if I could get 16½ lakhs conscience money out of the Government of India, I should be very glad to take it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXV—Exchange—16·52 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVI—CIVIL WORKS—IN CHARGE OF CIVIL OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg leave to move for a grant not exceeding 37·53 lakhs for Civil Works in charge of civil officers."

Motion 690.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

690. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 34,260 for the Trichinopoly district board for special repairs to trunk roads caused by flood damages.*

Motions 691 to 695.

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—" May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Motions 691, 692 and 693 have no relation whatever to the demands which have been moved. Is it in order, Sir, to move them?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the hon. Member Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar had been here, and if he had moved these, Mr. Richards should have raised the point of order. But in the circumstances I really don't see why I should express an opinion on motions which have not been made."

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

691. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,000 for constructing a new fly-proof kitchen in the Central Jail, Rajahmundry.*

[25th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

679. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 33,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

680. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

681. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

682. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

683. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,164 for the officer and establishment for the Chentsus on the Nallamalais by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

684. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,326 for the settlement at Siddapuram, Kurnool, by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

685. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Commissioner of Labour and Industrial Settlement by Rs. 90,500.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

686. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Labour Commissioner by 1 lakh.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

687. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

688. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by 2 lakhs.*

The demand for 7.87 lakhs under Labour and allied departments, minus Rs. 21,380, being the deductions made by the House, was then put and carried and the grant was made.

IV

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon the PRESIDENT :—“ Before the House rises for lunch, I have to mention that the number of candidates nominated for election to the Public Accounts Committee is 13, while the number of seats to be filled up is 7. An election of 7 candidates, out of the 13, by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in the Council Chamber at 5-40 p.m. to-day.”

The House then adjourned for lunch at 2-5 p.m. and re-assembled at 3 p.m.

25th March 1922]

III—cont.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—cont.

DEMAND XXV—EXCHANGE.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 16·52 lakhs under Demand XXV—Exchange."

Motion 689.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

689. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,52,000 for Exchange by Rs. 100.*

"My object in moving this is merely to know why we in this presidency, who are not responsible for the exchange policy resulting in this loss, should bear this loss. From the statement made by the hon. the Finance Member when presenting the budget, I see we paid nothing last year and that there were some orders from the Government of India fixing some rate and saying that we in this presidency should pay according to that rate and that the loss should be borne from the coming year. I suppose it is not a votable or a non-votable item and I do not know what it is. I do not say anything at all one way or the other. I do not want to embarrass my hon. Friend, but I want him on behalf of this presidency to represent to the Government of India and the Secretary of State that we are not responsible for this loss and that we should not be debited with any of this. I would like to know what my hon. Friend himself thinks about the matter, but I do think, Sir, that it is one of those old maxims that those who have no control should not be asked to pay. In this particular instance we have no control whatever over the financial policy which has resulted, or which is likely to result in this loss. I would therefore make this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I am not quite sure if I have clearly understood my hon. Friend's motion, but as far as I can make out, it amounts to this, that because the Government of India have not been very successful in their currency policy so far as it relates to the matter of exchange, we are to demand of them that they shall arrange for us to transact business always on the basis of a 2s. rupee. If the hon. Member will give me any plausible arguments with which I can enforce that request when I go to Simla to discuss the question of the contribution, I shall be glad to consider them. But I am afraid at present I should be laughed out of court before I had stated his proposition."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, so far as I can recollect, I do not think that we have had this loss debited against us in any of the previous years. If that is a fact, it is a sufficient argument why we should not be burdened with this this time."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"If I may invite my friend's attention to paragraphs 166, 167 and 168 of the memorandum, he will find an explanation of the reason why this was not debited in the previous year. It amounts simply to this, that the Government of India had not fixed the rate. We are therefore bringing forward a supplementary estimate now that

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[25th March 1922]

they have fixed it. As regards the coming year, they have fixed the rate and that has enabled us to put it in the budget and not to ask for a supplementary grant at the end of the year."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Before I withdraw my motion, I would only say one word and that is that perhaps the Government of India were convinced before that they were responsible for the financial muddle which has resulted in this great loss and that that was the reason why they did not fix the rate hitherto and did not call upon Local Governments to make a contribution on the result of their transactions. But now they are clearly making an attempt to raise a debit against these provinces and I trust the hon. the Finance Member when he goes to Simla will make the best of the situation and try to get it withdrawn as early as possible."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I need hardly say, Sir, that if I could get 16½ lakhs conscience money out of the Government of India, I should be very glad to take it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXV—Exchange—16·52 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVI—CIVIL WORKS—IN CHARGE OF CIVIL OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg leave to move for a grant not exceeding 37·53 lakhs for Civil Works in charge of civil officers."

Motion 690.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

690. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 34,260 for the Trichinopoly district board for special repairs to trunk roads caused by flood damages.*

Motions 691 to 695.

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—" May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Motions 691, 692 and 693 have no relation whatever to the demands which have been moved. Is it in order, Sir, to move them?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the hon. Member Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar had been here, and if he had moved these, Mr. Richards should have raised the point of order. But in the circumstances I really don't see why I should express an opinion on motions which have not been made."

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

691. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,000 for constructing a new fly-proof kitchen in the Central Jail, Rajahmundry.*

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

692. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,280 for constructing 15 cells for juveniles in the Central Jail, Cannanore, by Rs. 9,680.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

693. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 16,000 for constructing 32 cells in the close prison, Central Jail, Trichinopoly.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

694. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,18,000 for original works by Rs. 100.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

695. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37.53 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—In charge of Civil Officers by Rs. 5 lakhs.*

Demand XXVI—Civil Works—In charge of Civil officers—37.53 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS (RESERVED PORTIONS).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 2.14 lakhs under Demand XXVII—Civil Works (Reserved portions).”

Motion 696.

3-15 p.m.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

696. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 11,000 for constructing a left wing in front of the Military Secretary's room in the building at Government House, Ootacam und.*

“ In making this motion I should like to have, Sir, some information as regards the arrangements that are made in Ootacamund for the Government House. For the last two or three years there have been provided several extensions both by building new buildings and by taking over other buildings occupied by other people. In the last year provision was made for the construction of two or three buildings and also for the construction of two gates. Such of us as had been to Ootacamund last year found that some of the buildings that were occupied hitherto by the clerks were occupied by the bodyguards of His Excellency the Governor. I do not know, Sir, whether it is the intention of Government that those buildings ought to be taken over for the Government House and that they should also form part of the Government House hereafter. They are in a very good locality and they could be utilized as residences of Under Secretaries and others. If they are not wanted they can be sold. If they are sold they will fetch very good prices indeed. So, Sir, it is with the intention of asking what are the new buildings that are to be put up in the current year and what is proposed to be done next year and whether it is the intention of the Government to take over these buildings which were occupied by the clerks permanently for the Government House that I brought this motion. One object which induced me to do this is this. These buildings are not provided for in the current

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

year's budget while the estimate has been sanctioned in February and work has already been started."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am afraid I cannot regard these enquiries as relevant to a motion to omit a specific allotment for Rs. 11,000. I am quite prepared to justify that allotment. As a matter of fact it is the remainder of a very much larger sum for a work which is in progress and which is practically finished. I cannot carry in my head all the items of work for the next year. This particular item was, I understand, sanctioned by the Government of India and provision was made from the current year out of the lump allotment passed by this House. The Chief Engineer tells me that the work is practically done."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"It would have been better if some information were given. I see the difficulty of the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"If the hon. Member had given me notice, I would have come prepared."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"As I said it is not my particular intention to object to this particular grant. So I don't press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXVII.—Civil Works—Public Works officers for 2.14 lakhs was then put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS
(TRANSFERRED PORTIONS).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I beg to move Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a provision of 7.11 lakhs."

Motion 697.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERMAL CHETTI :—

697. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing a residence for the Collector, Coimbatore.*

Motion 698.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

698. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for new Collector's office, Vellore.*

"At page 8, item No. 10, it will be seen that the estimate is said to cost Rs. 2,12,400. The outlay was Rs. 2,929 for land acquisition and the probable amount of expenditure for the current year is estimated to be only Rs. 1,000. For 1921-22 the amount put down there is only Rs. 1,000 and the amount proposed to be spent for the next year is Rs. 30,000. As only the land seems to have been acquired and as only very little amount out of the total estimate is expected to be spent during the year, I think, Sir, we may as well postpone the commencement of the execution of this work till we

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

arrive at more fortunate times. That is my idea. I do not mean to say that this should be abandoned. In fact, Sir, North Arcot is my own district. I should be the last man to cut away any item of expenditure there. All I can say is whether this cannot be postponed."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—
"I am glad, Sir, that the proposer of this motion is a native of North Arcot district. I feel certain that any appeal I may make to him on behalf of North Arcot will not fall on deaf ears. This new district was constituted in 1911 and ever since that time repeated attempts have been made for the purpose of securing a habitation for its principal office in the district. The necessary land and building called 'Mayne's bungalow' were acquired nearly seven years ago. Plans and estimates were prepared on several occasions since but they had to be turned down on each occasion on the score of improvements which were suggested from time to time thereto. Last year we had final plans and estimates but according to the arrangement which was then suggested that new works should not be included in the budget, this estimate should not have been included in the last year's estimate. Nevertheless it was so included and was allowed to get through. Probably the House knew full well that inasmuch as I had deliberately included it I would justify the allotment entered in the budget. The gentleman who had tabled the motion last year to eliminate that sum did not move that motion feeling, as I said, that I would justify the position. From 1918 onwards officer after officer who visited North Arcot has noted that the Collector's office was housed in a most incommodious, inconvenient and dingy little building which was originally intended to be occupied by the gosha ladies of some of the State prisoners who were removed to the Vellore fort. The records are not merely kept in different parts of these offices but they are also kept in the building called the Mayne's bungalow which, as already stated, was acquired seven years ago and which has not yet been reconstructed. A portion of the records, I am told, still remains in Chittoor as there is no room for them in Vellore. Under these circumstances I ask whether efficient administration is possible at all. In November last I went to Vellore and had the estimate considerably curtailed because I knew the financial stringency. If the building is not now sanctioned the consequence will be that nearly 50 to 60 thousand rupees which was spent seven years ago for the acquisition of the site and building thereon called Mayne's bungalow which is now tumbling down and the money spent in 1920-21 as well as that spent in the current year will all be waste. I, therefore, ask the House, and particularly the mover of the motion who happens to be a native of the North Arcot district, whether he would allow the administration of his own district to be conducted in such distressing conditions. I can assure the House that the work is really being done under most distressing conditions. The consequence of dropping the proposal will be that all the parties and their pleaders and other gentlemen who wish to see the Collector will have to go to his residence. They have all to go to his residence because there is no place in the office to receive them. For this reason we have also installed telephonic communication between his office and residence."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I do not press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 699.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

699. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for quarters for the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah.*

"I wish to know if any rent is collected on such buildings, or are they built merely to accommodate the officers free."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Ordinary rent will be charged. The item is an item passed by the Council after a good deal of debate."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"If it is to be rented, then I wish to make a few remarks. An investment of Rs. 30,000 at 7 per cent on capital and 3 per cent on maintenance should bring a return of Rs. 250 per month. Is the District Forest Officer who is to occupy the House likely to pay Rs. 250 per mensem? I do not think so. This investment will therefore not pay."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"During the course of the debate on budget grants last year, the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to state that the question of levying higher rates of rents was under correspondence with the Secretary of State and I do not know what the result of that is. If the old system is to continue, I am sure the tax-payer will be a great loser. According to the existing rates, if I remember right, the officer has to pay 10 per cent of his salary or 5 per cent of the invested amount whichever be less. Now, the Government is borrowing at the rate of 6 per cent and the cost of maintaining these buildings is generally calculated to be 2 per cent of the cost of construction. That means that unless we levy 8 or 9 per cent of the invested amount as annual rent on public buildings, the interest on the amount invested on these buildings will not be paid and the tax-payer will have to pay it. In this connexion I wish to know the reason why all these buildings that are built for public officers are built from the ordinary revenues of the State. They are works of permanent utility. They are expected to pay some return and why should not the Government have a scheme for this and utilize the borrowed capital for the construction of these buildings? Why should they go on in the old method of meeting the expenditure from the ordinary revenues and make it a burden on the present generation when they are works of a permanent nature."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"On the last point I would only say this : that we are going to meet out of the advance not only this but a good deal of our current expenditure in the current year. As regards the matter of calculation of rates of rent, that is a matter arising in the transferred Department of Public Works."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am glad, Sir, that the question has been raised, because it gives me an opportunity of emphasising a matter which is of a very great importance to the Forest Department, namely, the provision of decent housing for our officers. Year after year we have been obliged to cut out essential proposals for the housing of the District Forest Officers. This year I think something like seven or eight items have gone out. It is a very serious question what we are to do with new recruits when

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

they come out. They have to be posted somewhere; we do not know to what districts to post them, because not a house of a suitable description can be found in many districts. I could give many instances in point. Some were mentioned last year. I should be very thankful if the discussion of this particular motion led to a thorough investigation of the steps which are necessary to remedy a state of affairs which can only be described as extremely unsatisfactory. The practical financial difficulty lies in the fact that you cannot expect officers to pay rents which will give an adequate return on the present rates at which buildings are constructed by the Public Works Department. It is quite certain that 10 per cent of the salaries of the occupiers in the case of forest officers will not ordinarily give an adequate return on the cost of buildings of this sort. It seems to me that there are two alternatives. One is to recognize frankly that the additional cost must be met by the State and the other is to drop the method of employing the Public Works Department to build substantial structures and to ask our officers to accept houses of brick and mud with thatched roofs such as those often constructed for railway engineers when railway works are in progress. They are fairly cool, and comfortable; and they would be better than nothing. As things are now, rented bungalows are not procurable. And there are cases of men living miles away from their headquarters because they are not able to get proper accommodation. It is a very serious question; and the seriousness is going to be aggravated now that the Council, as I am glad to note, has committed itself to a policy of development, because that will mean more forest officers as our development schemes go forward expanding, as I hope, rapidly. We shall have to provide some form of housing for our officers, for one cannot expect men to go and work in places where there are no houses, no roofs over their heads. I have again to say that I am very glad that the matter has been brought forward."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 700.

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—

700. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for quarters for the Conservator, Salem.*

Motion 701.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

701. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 29,000 for constructing district registrar's office.*

"This is item 13 at page 8 of the Public Works budget. The amount of the estimate is Rs. 39,000. Nothing was spent in 1920-21 and in 1921-22 also nothing seems to have been spent. But in 1922-23 Rs. 29,000 is proposed to be spent. It appears to me that it is altogether a new work. Consequently, I wish to know whether this cannot be postponed, if it cannot be abandoned."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, this is an incomplete work for which already Rs. 3,000 have been spent. By mistake it is not so stated in the budget estimate."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 702.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

"702. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,800 for iron record-racks for the District Court, Trichinopoly.*"

Motion 703.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

703. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,500 for constructing a fly-proof kitchen in the new Central Jail, Vellore.*

"My reason for making the motion is this: Rs. 29,000 for a kitchen appears to be very high. It is impossible to make a kitchen absolutely fly-proof. Flies will get in somehow. Even persons with cleanly habits and clean dress have flies over them, and even under a punka flies are seen sitting on the food on the dining table. Much more so, in the case of cooks and maties who are unclean and dirty. Flies naturally sit on them, and thus they are carried into the kitchen. Any provision for fly-proof shutters to a kitchen is a waste and may be avoided."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, on expert examination and on expert counsel ranging, I believe, for about three years, the system of having fly-proof kitchens in the Central Jails has been adopted.

With all respect to the hon. Mover I cannot accept his ideas as to what is necessary for sanitary purposes in the jails. Anyhow we have already spent Rs. 14,000 last year. I do not know whether the hon. Member proposes that further work should now be stopped and the money already spent should be wasted. I may mention this for the information of the hon. Member: that most of the coolie labour in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen is convict labour which we are using for the purpose. If he thinks that we are spending more, there again, Sir, I am under the control of the Public Works Department, which scrutinizes every single rupee which is spent. I am unable to see how I can stop the work now."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"I do not propose that the work should be stopped. I simply say that the fly-proof shutters which is an item of expenditure may be abandoned and other items such as flooring, roofing, etc., may be proceeded with. In this way savings may be effected."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Probably my experience may be of some use to the Council and my friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiar. In the Trivandrum Central Jail large numbers of persons were suffering from dysentery and in spite of best treatment of the medical officer in charge of the prisons, this disease persisted in continuing. At length a suggestion was made that, if a fly-proof kitchen was provided for the room in which food was cooked for the prisoners, the disease would disappear. The suggestion was adopted and there was an immediate and perceptible improvement in

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

the health of the prisoners. So, I believe, there is really benefit in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen in the jails where large numbers of persons are confined. Probably, in the light of this information, my friend will not press his resolution."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I think, if the hon. Mover would visit the fly-proof kitchen in the Penitentiary, he will see that it is possible to keep flies out."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 704.

3-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

704. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,000 for constructing quarters for inspector, etc.*

" Sir, the total cost of the estimate as entered in page 10 of the Civil Works budget is Rs. 63,300. According to the book on type-designs and their cost published by the Public Works Department, I find an inspector's quarters should cost Rs. 2,510. A head constable's quarters should cost Rs. 273 and a constable's hut should cost Rs. 174. Applying these rates the total cost of building one inspector's quarters and huts for 7 head constables and 80 constables must be Rs. 18,341. I find 75 per cent should be added to it to arrive at the current schedule of rates."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I ask the hon. Member what is the date of the scale from which he is quoting as the standard rate."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" This work was published in 1907 or 1908. I am adding 75 per cent to the cost to bring up the total to the present schedule rates. Applying the rates as appearing in the book referred to above and adding 75 per cent the total of this work ought to be Rs. 32,000 and not more. Still a sum of Rs. 63,000 is provided for. I wish to know why there is so much difference in the sanctioned amount."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I am afraid I am not in a position to enter into the details of the estimate for these buildings; but I observe that they are to be constructed in a place called Russellkonda, which is rather remote from civilization or at least from those aspects of civilization which include ample provision of labour and building materials. It is just possible that that is the reason why this estimate seems high. But it would be really a much more practical proposition, though in this case it is rather late in the day if my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar—I know he is a great contractor—would come forward with tenders at rates substantially below those adopted by the Public Works Department. If he is prepared to do that, I have not the slightest doubt that something in the nature of a deal would be quite welcome."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" Last year the hon. the Home Member offered a similar contract to me. What I wish to say is that even if we add 75 per cent, the total estimate comes only to Rs. 32,000. Taking into consideration the distance from the railway centre, there must be some reason for the cost being double. As the hon. the Home Member promised to go into the matter, I do not press the motion."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I first of all say, Sir, that this is not a matter which I, as Home Member, can go into? The matter is in the hands of the hon. the Minister."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—" Sir, there is no special need for increasing the estimate at Russellkonda. Russellkonda is a place which abounds in building materials. There is also a saw-mill located there. That means there is a timber depot at Russellkonda. Bricks and all building materials are also available at very cheap rates at Russellkonda. I come from that place and I claim that it is not far from civilization. It is my firm conviction that building materials are much cheaper in Russellkonda than at any other place in the Ganjam district. Therefore, I do not see why this estimate should have been increased to such a large amount as Rs. 63,300."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" From what the hon. the Home Member has stated, it is really a matter for consideration for the hon. the Minister in charge of the Public Works Department whether he cannot reconsider the estimates prepared. Here is a statement made by a distinguished gentleman of the experience of Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar. He is not speaking without facts and figures. He has considerable experience in contract work. He knows exactly how things are working in different places. I think, the Council should benefit by the observations made by him from his great experience. I would therefore appeal to the hon. the Minister to go into the matter fully and see if any reduction is possible. This much I do say that it is not always safe to adhere to rates mentioned by the Public Works Department, as something sacred and immutable. We have known time and on that a work for which an estimate had been prepared by the Public Works Department for a high figure could be done for a much lower sum."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" There are schedule rates for each part of districts. The Assistant Engineer there in charge of the Russellkonda division is a very experienced officer who has constructed seven buildings recently in that locality. I am sure he must have taken the standard rates of the Public Works Department into consideration. But, if really there is anything which is very much in the estimate, I will draw his attention to the remarks made by hon. Members in this House that the estimate deserves reconsideration in the light of what has been stated here."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I wish to point out that there is another work on this list and applying this principle of adding 75 per cent to the rates quoted from this book the estimate amount sanctioned is approximately correct. That item is 52. XXX and 41. Provincial Civil Works. It is only in the case of item 28 there is an enormous increase and I therefore wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister to that fact."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Before the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his motion, may I say, Sir, that this very item finds place in last year's budget? The figure entered there as the total of the estimate is Rs. 52,300 and the authority sanctioning it is given as a Government Order, dated 24th April 1917. Since April 1917, there have been increases in the cost of labour and building materials. That, I presume, accounts for the fact that the estimate is now entered as Rs. 63,300. But in the absence of the estimate, I am entirely unable to say whether it follows

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

the particular type-design referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyyar. I do not think we can profitably discuss the details of the case. We must leave that issue to the Minister to settle with the Chief Engineer afterwards if need be."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 705.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

705. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for residence to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Western range.*

"Sir, I think a sum of Rs. 56,900 spent on this building should fetch Rs. 5,700 per annum (providing 7 or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for the capital cost and $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for maintenance and repair) or Rs. 500 per mensem approximately. The utmost that we can realize from the occupant is Rs. 200 per mensem and the net monthly loss for the Government is Rs. 300. I wish to know whether a less pretentious building could not be provided and the loss averted."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, the position is just the same as that which I explained with regard to the earlier resolution. This particular item was entered in last year's budget and was passed by the Council last year. There is now an increase in the total amount owing, I presume, to the increased cost of labour and building materials in the interval. We want a house for the Deputy Inspector-General of Police at Coimbatore. He is at present allowed to live either in Ootacamund or Coonoor, because he cannot find any accommodation whatsoever at Coimbatore. Whether there is a profit or loss to Government, it is certainly incumbent upon Government to house this police officer in Coimbatore. The questions of the cost of building and the amount of rent that we derive from it are matters for my hon. colleague Mr. Patro."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member observed that, because we sanctioned this amount last year, there does not appear to be any reason for changing our view now."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I say at once that something like Rs. 20,000 is expected to be spent on this building before the end of this year, if I do not misapprehend the entry made at page 11 of the Public Works Budget estimate. That is the reason why we must go on with the work."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"If we have already wasted some money paying higher rates than were necessary according to the observation made by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyyar, I do not see why we should not go into the matter now if the rates already fixed require revision. Even if we had spent a part of the money, much more remains to be spent. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly re-examine the question of reduction."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I understand that contracts have already been given."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 706.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

706. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1.5 lakhs for constructing temporary buildings for the special police force in Malabar by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Motion 707.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :

707. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,50,000 for constructing police lines for special police, Malabar.*

“ Sir, in page 10 of the Public Works Budget Estimate against item No. 42, in the column ‘ references and remarks ’, nothing is quoted. It appears to me that this probable outlay of Rs. 50,000 is undoubtedly being spent in the course of the year to meet an emergent occasion, that is to locate certain temporary police officers. It appears to me that there is absolutely no reason why for temporary police permanent buildings should be constructed there. It cannot be the object of the Government that special police should be permanently stationed in Malabar for all time to come. It should only be to meet an emergency and if the country settles down to peace and order, I fail to see in the first place why there is any necessity for constructing police lines at a cost of Rs. 2 lakhs. In the second place, the estimate is stated to be Rs. 2 lakhs. It is within square brackets. It means that the estimate is not finally arrived at. It is only an experiment and a surmise and not a definite amount arrived at by careful calculation and scrutiny. It is also stated that Rs. 50,000 will be spent or has been spent already or is being spent. I think, Sir, that seeing that the trouble has already subsided, the sum of Rs. 50,000 already spent will meet the emergency and no further amount need be spent for this purpose. Moreover I think that if we erect large buildings and place the police there, they will always try to justify their existence there by raking up some trouble here or there and they will try to remain there for ever. It is necessary that no room should be given for such temptation at all. If we give them small quarters and try to get them out of Malabar as early as possible then it will lead to the peaceful and harmonious living of the people as before. I therefore submit that this sum of Rs. 1,50,000 can very well be omitted from this year’s budget.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The line of criticism which the hon. Member pursued leaves me aghast. It is our desire to maintain the peace of Malabar by the location of a special force, over 600 in number, specially armed and specially equipped and they will, I fear, have to be retained in the district not for one year but for many years to come. I cannot imagine that the inhabitants of Malabar would welcome the immediate withdrawal of this force. If they are to continue there for some years, obviously you must provide them with buildings of a semi-permanent nature for their accommodation. It is only buildings of a semi-permanent nature that are contemplated, and they must be put up before the monsoon. That is the reason why detailed estimates were not in existence at the time when the budget was prepared.

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

This matter was engaging the very serious attention of the local officers in Malabar and of the Government in the month of February.

4 p.m. It was abundantly apparent that we must get a real move on with the construction of these buildings. The question of cost per square foot was carefully examined. I believe I am right in saying that the class of buildings contemplated is of a semi-permanent nature—iron roofing and mud floors with walls and ceilings of wood. I am sorry I cannot give any more details: but this I may say that the scheme of construction makes it probable that if these buildings should ultimately not be required—though I do not myself think that that contingency is likely to arise for many years, a considerable proportion of the materials can be sold. I do not think that the House will require any further justification from me of the necessity of the provision of accommodation for the special police who have to be maintained for the public peace in Malabar.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to say in what places it is proposed to construct the buildings ? ”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I understand the scheme contemplated is six armed camps in different places. I cannot trust my memory to say in exactly what places the buildings are to be constructed. Perintal-manna is one. I will give the hon. Member a list afterwards. The places were very carefully selected in consultation with Mr. Knapp, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Evans. I compared the sites proposed with the maps of Ernad and Walluvanad, and satisfied myself that they are suitable places.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ Sir, the feeling in the district is that these armed camps should continue for a long time to come. The time is not yet in sight when we can with any sense of public safety abolish the special police force. Therefore I shall appeal to the hon. Mover to withdraw the resolution.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I do not want to press the motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 708 and 709.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

708. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for armed reserve town police.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

709. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 to extend the office buildings of the Criminal Investigation Department.*

Motion 710.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHEITI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

710. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.*

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti]

[25th March 1922]

“The sanctioned estimate is Rs. 1,67,000. But no particulars are given as to the number of huts to be built, the number of quarters for sub-inspectors and for inspectors, etc. Such details would help members to ascertain whether the sanctioned amount is or is not according to cost detailed in the book on type designs.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I cannot say off-hand. I imagine that this item is identical with item 139 in last year's budget estimate where the details given are one sub-inspector, three sergeants, fourteen head constables and one hundred and forty-three constables. But it is just possible that since then there have been some changes in the strength of the reserve and consequently some expansion of accommodation.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“I withdraw the motion, Sir.”
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 711

The following motion was not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

711. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.*

Motion 712.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

712. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the construction of the engineering school buildings at Vizagapatam.*

“My idea in making this motion is to draw attention to the fact that a certain proportion of the students trained in the school will be of no use in the future. I have got sympathy for my own part of the country and for the construction of engineering school buildings for Vizagapatam. But now, on account of the reduction in the temporary engineering establishment a number of temporary subordinates are without work. Besides this we have a number of passed candidates seeking employment without being able to get any. These engineering students cannot get employment anywhere else except in the Government service or in the local fund department. There are now nearly 150 students trained every year in the college at Guindy and in the school at Vizagapatam. For each student an expenditure of Rs. 2,500 is incurred in addition to his own private expenditure. If students are admitted year after year like this, I am sure that the number of students who succeed from the school and college will be far in excess of the demand either by the Government or by the local bodies. The students who pass from these institutions will be of no use for they cannot like medical students set up private practice. These engineering students have no go other than entry into the Government or quasi-Government service. No doubt in Europe there is scope for private enterprise for engineering students, but in India there is no scope for them as the people cannot afford to pay much for the engineer for their buildings. My principal idea in moving this is that I have been repeatedly

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

telling the Government that irrigation works are being neglected, and that more money should be devoted to improve them. Irrigation works not only remunerate the Government but profit the people also.

“My another point is I have no objection to school buildings being constructed at Vizagapatam provided you stop similar classes in the Madras College of Engineering. There is no use spending money without any hope of getting an employment for the students, who spend everything they have to find at the end of their course that they have nothing to fall back upon.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Repeated representations were made to the Government that the Engineering College was not able to afford room for all the applicants. Year after year a large number of applicants were to be refused admission. In fact the number of admissions was only a very small percentage of the applicants admitted. Resolutions were moved urging on the Government the necessity of starting an engineering institution in the north and in the south to afford facilities for all who sought admission. Now my hon. Friend says that because a policy of retrenchment is being pursued in the Public Works Department there is a certain amount of grumbling among those who have been dispensed with. He asks where are we going to find employment for them? I will ask him what are we going to do with the people who are turned out of the arts colleges, medical colleges year after year? It is not merely for the purpose of entering Government service that people must seek admission in these colleges. There are various avenues for them. They can take contracts under the Public Works Department and the Local Boards. The old idea that we are only to look up to the Government service after passing out of the colleges must be given up now.

4-15 p.m. We are changing our policy and principle. In the revised Engineering College calendar we have introduced a clause that there should be no guarantee for students passing out of the college. Originally, in order to draw people into the Engineering College, there was a clause that a certain number would be given appointments. We afterwards found that such a large number were seeking admission that it was necessary to restrict the number, and the guaranteed appointments are also to be taken away. Only yesterday I received a letter from one of my friends from Vizianagaram asking that I should afford facilities for him to get admission to his son in the Vizagapatam Engineering College.

“Again, now, in view of the Telugu University, there will be several colleges started in the area. We must concentrate our energy in a particular place and we must multiply institutions there in order to achieve the Andhra University. Therefore I am sorry this narrow view of the question with regard to the Engineering College will not be the proper thing. I think the hon. Member will view the whole question in the light I have presented and withdraw his motion.”

MR. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“The hon. the Minister was pleased to say that these passed candidates might take up works under Government on contract. I am sorry to say that such contractors who have taken work are few and miserable. Generally, the executive officers do not like passed engineers to work under them, because they might find out their mistakes and expose them. People in the Andhra country have said for a long time that they should

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

[25th March 1922]

have an Engineering College at Vizagapatam. It was a fact that there was a demand from a number of Arts students. Then there was some hesitation as to whether a college should be opened at Vizagapatam. Subsequently the Government adopted the policy of admitting graduate students from the several districts and from different communities. That time is now gone. The hon. Minister said that he had several letters from his friends asking for facilities for the admission of their sons into the Engineering College. But even now, people ignorant of the present conditions and the difficulty of getting jobs think that every one of them that pass out of the Engineering College could get the job either of a sub-overseer, or a canal supervisor, which is a very remunerative job. We cannot allow them to think that there is still a genuine demand for these people. We know how many overseers and supervisors are hanging on this Secretariat. What is the fate of these people?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Does the hon. Member want his motion to be voted upon?"

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"I do not want to press the motion if the hon. the Minister assures me that he will give my appeal a favourable consideration."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"If he wants all these people to be employed under Government I will have to ask my hon. Friend to find sources for employing these people. Already my hon. Friends have strongly advocated retrenchment, and we have retrenched 6 lakhs. If he wants that all the passed people should be employed, he will have to provide the necessary funds for the purpose."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 713 and 714.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

713. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the new Engineering school buildings, Vizagapatam.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

714. *To omit the allotment of 0·1 lakh for the construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

Motion 715.

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

715. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

"Mr. President, the percentage of scholars to the total population in this Presidency is 4·4. The total number of boys and girls that ought to be in schools is 15 per cent of the total population. In the year, 1920-21, the net expenditure on education was 144 lakhs. When all the boys and girls in the

25th March 1922]

[Mr. E. C. M. Mascarenhas]

country go to school, the expenditure will be not less than 500 lakhs. It is evident that this large amount of money cannot be obtained without further taxation.

“Sir, if education is to be extended and at the same time expenditure kept down as low as possible, Government schools should not be unnecessarily increased, but aided schools encouraged.

“The average annual cost of educating each pupil in Government institutions comes to Rs. 54-9-9, whereas the cost to the Government of such a pupil in an aided institute is Rs. 3-15-2 only, or in other words, it is one-fourteenth of the expenditure in the Government institute.

“Sir, now I will speak on the state of affairs in Mangalore. An aided training school for mistresses was started there in 1890 or 32 years ago. It has trained and is training teachers of all communities. Up till now it has admitted 625 girls and turned out 227 secondary mistresses and 316 elementary mistresses or a total of 543 mistresses and these are employed not only in various parts of this Presidency but also in other Presidencies.

“Instead of allowing this aided institute to develop, Government stepped in, in 1912 and opened a training school for mistresses in a rented building, and now it has made a provision of Rs. 10,000 for a combined training school for mistresses and girls' school. The estimate does not seem to have been prepared as the amount is left blank in the budget estimate. If this Government school is for training elementary mistresses in Kanarese only, then there is no objection; but, if on the other hand, it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade English training school, then I am afraid the existing aided school, which is run cheaply, will have to be closed for want of pupils. I therefore request the hon. the Minister for Education to let this House know—

(a) what the combined girls' school and training school for mistresses will cost for the buildings;

(b) whether the accommodation is for an elementary girls' school and training school for elementary mistresses only; and

(c) whether it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade training school for mistresses.

“Sir, I am asking for this information, so that we may sanction only what expenditure is absolutely necessary for a combined elementary Kanarese training school for the needs of the South Kanara district and nothing more, and also to help in keeping down expenditure on the score of economy, as low as possible.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, as to the necessity for a training school, there is no question, because the girls' school was there for a very long time and it has been very popular. And attached to the girls' school we have had also a training school at which it is intended not only to train elementary grade but also secondary grade teachers in that part of the West Coast. There are also other private schools which have got such a training section attached to them. In that district there are three girls' schools, but this is a very flourishing girls' school where we have got 400 pupils and most of the pupils are Indian Christians. There are a few Hindus and few European girls also. In order to improve the school a training section was attached, and it is located in a rented building. So, in 1920, the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[25th March 1922]

Government sanctioned a new site for the school. Already, Rs. 15,645 was spent for the acquisition of the land, and it will all go to waste if we give it up now. The building is an urgent necessity. The school authorities are pressing on the inspectors and the inspectors have reported to Government that accommodation for locating the training institution is urgently necessary and that it would meet a large demand not only in Mangalore but in the neighbouring taluks also. It will spread over the whole district and the whole district will have a training institution in Mangalore."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"I think the opening of this Government school was a mistake. It was not established long ago, but in 1912. I have some figures. From the year 1915-16 to 1919-20, a total of 221 pupils have been trained in it out of which 4 are Anglo-Indians, 190 Indian Christians, 14 Brahmans and 13 non-Brahmans. In the aided schools, 261 have been trained, in the same period, of which 135 are Anglo-Indians, 120 Indian Christians and 6 non-Brahmans, whereas in the other Government institute we had 190 Indian Christians. Government have established the institute practically for training Indian Christians. Pupils of the other communities are very few. In Malabar also, there are training institutes. I think one is known as the Moyan training institute, and at Calicut also there is a training institute. The opening of a school at Mangalore was unnecessary, and I think the Government will do well to limit it to an elementary training school in Kanarese only."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Does the hon. Member wish to press his motion to a division?"

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"I do not wish to press it to a division, if the hon. the Minister for Education gives me an assurance that he will not develop that institution. I believe this provision of Rs. 10,000 is the thin end of the wedge."

Rao Bahadur A. RAMAYYA PUNJA :—"I rise to oppose this motion.

4-30 p.m. There is a strong necessity felt for a Government girls' school

in Mangalore. The Hindu inhabitants of this town urged upon the Government some years ago the necessity for the establishment of a girls' school there, because for want of a school like this, they had to send their girls to Christian institutions. It was on that consideration that this institution was opened by the Government and provided courses therein for training mistresses also. All are agreed at least that female education ought to be promoted, and that can only be done by a number of mistresses trained in Government training schools. Sanction was accorded for the establishment of such a school, and a piece of land was also acquired for this purpose in September 1920 at a cost of Rs. 15,645. The school was located for the time being in a rented building. Now it is found necessary that the Government should have a building of their own. I think it is with that object a sum of Rs. 10,000 is asked for. I do not see what reasonable objection could be made for building the school on the land that has already been acquired at a cost of Rs. 15,000 and odd. The objection now raised that there are already girls' schools conducted by Christian agencies is no reason why Government should not continue their existing school. The effect of withholding this amount would be to shut up the institution. I therefore strongly object to this motion."

25th March 1922]

MR. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“The hon. Mover has based his arguments mainly upon the discussion of the relative merits or advantages of aided institutions *versus* Government institutions. I think it is well for the Council to note that so far as possible the Educational Department and the Minister have been advocating a policy of encouraging the establishment of aided institutions. They do not advocate the maintenance of Government educational institutions except as a very last resort. There are many members present in this chamber who have had to press their claims very vehemently and very ardently upon the Government, asking them to assume control over aided institutions. What I have just stated is, however, the general policy of the Government. I should like further to state that about ten years ago, at a conference of Inspectresses, it was decided that training schools for women teachers in several places were necessary, and so far as the West Coast was concerned, Mangalore headed the list. It might be asked why Mangalore headed the list when, as has been pointed out, there is already one training school in existence there. Formerly, there were two training schools there. One has gone. The position is that at the Mission training school English is the main subject and there are not full facilities for instruction in Kanarese. As it is desirable, if we wish to pay due attention to the encouragement of the vernacular languages—”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“Aided schools also teach Kanarese.”

MR. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“English was the main language of instruction, and Kanarese was subsidiary. At that time numerous applications were received from those in the Training School for exemption from the use of the vernacular language in the examination.”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“Applications for exemptions were apparently received from the Anglo-Indians and not from the other sections of people.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Before we proceed further, I wish to point out that we cannot deal with the whole question of Government schools *versus* aided schools on a motion like this. I would appeal to hon. Members that such a large issue could not be profitably discussed on a small motion like this.”

MR. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“We shall have numerous exemptions to be granted if we desire to emphasise that instruction should be in vernacular, and we have received several applications for exemption last year. I might now refer to the report of the Director of Public Instruction for last year—I merely refer to the actual number that has been read by the hon. Mover—wherein you find that in aided schools out of the total number of girls undergoing instruction there are more in number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christian girls than there are in Government schools. If you go into the figures with regard to the Government school in Mangalore, there is only a single Anglo-Indian. There is a large number of Indian Christians, but there are also Indians, i.e., Brahmans and non-Brahmans, while in the aided school there is not a single Brahman or non-Brahman. These, Sir, are the facts. When we set up this Government institution it was for the definite and specific purpose of training teachers in Kanarese as their main language, thus paying attention to the vernacular, and now, when

[Mr. R. Littlehales]

[25th March 1922]

we find it necessary also for giving more facilities for all classes of people to receive the necessary instruction which they do much more readily in a Government institution than in aided institutions we have to provide such a school. I do not labour further the point, but so far as the point whether such an institution is necessary, I may say, as I have already pointed out, there were previously two schools. One was under the old Basel Mission, but that school was closed. Government stepped in and they maintain their own training school. That might be cited as an argument to show that the Government do not want to start an institution as a rival to an existing one, but only to replace the institution which fell out owing to the war and other causes. I want to impress upon the Members of this Council that we have already acquired the land, we have already got some drawings and plans for the building, and under these conditions the building ought to go on."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"We have not been told what is going to be the cost of the building."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Will the hon. Member withdraw the motion?"

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"If the hon. the Minister will assure me that it will be an elementary training school."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"There can be no conditional withdrawal."

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

Motions 716 to 718.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

716. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

717. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

718. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Motion 719.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

719. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

"I find at page 10 of the Public Works Budget estimate for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club amounting to Rs. 1,63,800. The probable outlay during 1921-22 is shown as Rs. 11,000 and under 'grant for 1922-23 for works in progress' there is a sum of Rs. 75,000 provided. Sir, this work formed the subject of discussion last year, and in the column of amount of estimate there was absolutely nothing given. No estimate had been prepared and no information was given to the House, but a sum of

25th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Rs. 32,000 was asked for, and I remember a number of hon. Members including myself had tabled resolutions for the omission thereof. But owing to the fact that there was no time to discuss this matter, there being other more important items, it was not discussed with the result that it was deemed to have been admitted. Now it appears that Rs. 11,000 has been spent in the year, and our sanction is now asked for an estimate of Rs. 1,63,800 whereof Rs. 75,000 can be utilized this year. I object to the grant as a whole, on the ground that in this year of financial stringency such a large sum of money on an item like this should not be spent. There are also more important grounds on which I object to this. The place has got a very bad reputation. It is that it has been the location of a venereal diseases hospital and the biggest drain in Madras runs alongside of it. This is the property which now belongs to Government and which they now want to improve by spending on it the sum of Rs. 1,63,800. This thing came up for discussion in the Finance Committee and more than one member including Sir James Simpson disapproved of spending any money on this property. That is the opinion of the Finance Committee. Moreover, I heard the same objection raised in this Council also: that money to the extent of Rs. 1,63,800 ought not to be spent on this property.

"There is another reason for my objection. This property is not quite close to any of the colleges. No doubt the Christian College is about two furlongs from this as also the Law College. All the students who are not already located in hostels are living in close proximity to their colleges. This is not useful for anything except as a place for going to in the evening. It is not used by the students of colleges situated at a distance, and it is not a proper centre for them to justify the expenditure of a sum of Rs. 1,63,800 of which Rs. 75,000 is allotted for this year. On these grounds I oppose the grant."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB:—"Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. When I came before this Council for a Muhammadan high school in Georgetown and a college in Umdah Bagh for Muhammadans the Government opposed it and said that there were no funds. I sympathised with the Government. But the action of the Government in this case shows that they have got plenty of money or they are acting light-heartedly. They had provided funds for certain improvements to the club. Last year it was said if we do not cut down the funds under this head, the Government might come to us next year with a provision for Rs. 1½ lakhs. Year after year they are going on increasing this allotment.

"This place was formerly used not as a lunatic hospital, but one for the treatment of venereal diseases. With these few words, I support the motion."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, if at all I rise to speak on this motion, it is not merely because I am the member for the University of Madras, but because all educationists believe in the necessity of a students' club. We hear a great deal said about the need for the development of the character of the students and for seeing that they do not come under undesirable influences. One of the best ways of maintaining their character and of associating them with desirable men and influences is to provide for them a really good centre where the students can foregather. Those who have been educated in the west will bear testimony to the extreme value from the point of view of character of the famous

4-45 p.m.

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[25th March 1922]

students' societies called University Unions. This property was taken up and the students' club was started in Madras, if I remember aright, in order to counteract some of the undesirable influences which were working on the students of Madras, and I am told that it is doing very good work. I do not consider the students' club to be anything unnecessary or of the nature of a luxury, but I regard it as an integral part of the University organization. If I remember rightly with regard to all the newer universities that have been started or that are now proposed to be started, provision has been made for a students' club for the under-graduates. I am now only pleading for the principle of having a University students' club. I think it would be a very bad thing indeed if that idea was given up. But after I have listened to my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I am rather doubtful whether the present site is the best possible one. But, however, that is a matter for the people here, the authorities of the University and the officers of the Education Department to consider and decide upon. I should be very sorry if this House should vote this item out on the ground that the University club is a superfluity. Further, I find that already about Rs. 11,000 have been spent, and if we do not go on with the work and complete it, that money would be a waste. So long as the House does not vote it out on the ground that the University students' club is a luxury, I have nothing to say. Only let not an existing club be destroyed till another and a better one has been put up. But I do hope that the students of Madras, thousands of whom do not know how to spend their evenings between 5 and 7, will be provided with a splendid club in which all can foregather, and spend their time in a manner that will be conducive to their moral character."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I do not think there would be any question about the need for a University Students' Club in the City of Madras. This was started three years back with the view of bringing together college students living in Georgetown and of providing for them some common ground where they could meet and spend their evenings satisfactorily. In Georgetown, where a large number of college students live, there are a number of eating houses and hotels where students do not get their meals properly and the hotels are run in a very bad style. Therefore, in order to provide facilities for good food and for good social life this club was started. Another reason why this club was started was that the students of the colleges, for instance, the Christian College and the Pachaiyappa's College have got their hostels, but the Law College and the Medical College have no hostels. Therefore that a large number of students from these colleges, the Law College and the Medical College, may have quarters for themselves. Government have provided its own building. The building belongs to the Government and the Government spent Rs. 11,000 in repairing it. The building is in need of a lot of repair urgently, and in order to make it a residential place for students to live in it as a hostel, a gymnasium is attached to it with the requisite apparatus so that the students may go there morning and evening and take part in gymnasium exercise. This is the object of the students' club, and in order to give facilities for a large number of students who cannot get food in eating houses, meals are provided for them and they are charged for it. As I said, in order that it may be a useful social centre, a gymnasium is provided. In this way a large number of students receive relief from this place and it will be a pity if we should have to cut down anything of the grant. There is also a small reading room attached to it,

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

and in course of time it may develop into a regular club. In order that the students of the Madras City and of the colleges in its neighbourhood may very well learn the habits of social life and club life from the beginning and to distract them from the various undesirable influences and directions, they are brought together here so that they may meet each other in the mornings and evenings and thus necessarily have a sort of club life and social life gradually. Friendships and unions are formed and the whole atmosphere will be quite wholesome. Though it is a fact that the present locality is not a very healthy one, that it is in Popham's Broadway and that it was originally used for a hospital and that the building requires urgent repair, the principle of having a university club must be granted by every one. Therefore if this building is considered to be not suitable at all and if we can provide funds, we can find another place, and until then we may use this for the university club. If we are able to get two or three lakhs more we can put up another building, but we want this amount budgeted for, in order to carry on the necessary repairs and make necessary adjustments in the present building so that it may be used as a residential club. A building like that for the purpose of a club is absolutely necessary in these days. As I told you, undesirable influences are working in the minds of the students and we must provide a place where people could visit them from time to time and have social intercourse with them, have social parties so as to have a chastening influence on the members of the club. On the whole, I think it is a very desirable thing. Some time back some of us were invited to go to the place and see how it was working. At present it may not be all that is desirable, but in course of time it is capable of improvement. Therefore, I may say that this motion for a wholesale reduction of the grant is not at all desirable at present."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—"Sir, I desire to support the motion for the omission of this grant. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar in his opening remarks said that the first reason for urging this omission was financial stringency. It also struck me, Sir, as essential that in this year of financial stringency no amount should be spent on a luxury so to speak. But the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Reddi said that it should not be considered a luxury and that the Rs. 11,000 already spent on it would be a waste. I do not think so. Buildings in Popham's Broadway are fetching nearly five or six times their value about ten or twenty years ago. For instance, I may mention one building lately occupied by Messrs. Fox & Co. The owners were not able to realize more than Rs. 25,000 thirty years ago, but to-day, even if we offer Rs. 2,50,000 the owner would not sell the property. Even if the Government sell their building now, they would get five or six times its original cost, and the Rs. 11,000 spent on it already would not be a waste. As the surroundings are ill suited to the club, it is well the building is sold now, and a new building provided on the Marina."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, after listening to my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and the hon. the Minister I find that Mr. Ramalinga Reddi supported it only as a club for the evening, whereas the idea of the Minister is to convert it into a hostel which was not what Mr. Ramalinga Reddi wanted. As my friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar pointed out, the building has a value as house property in Popham's Broadway and the value can be realized by sale and the amount of Rs. 11,000 spent on it would not be a waste, and a suitable building can be obtained in any other locality.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

My friend spoke of foregathering of students. It can be done in the foreshore of Madras. That can very well be done in other parts in Madras where there are more beautiful structures and more desirable surroundings where young men can find amusement. I do not think that the surroundings of the present buildings are conducive to health and there is no scope for recreation. On all these grounds, I press this motion to a division."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I believe no objection was raised even by the mover of the motion to the establishment or the advantages of a University students' club. His main objection, so far as I have been able to follow him, was that the building was in an inconvenient locality and that the club was not doing very useful work. If that is the ground of objection, I believe the only way in which we ought to proceed is to allot more funds and have a better building in a more suitable locality. That is the direction in which I would request him to consider the desirability of improving the University students' club rather than by cutting down the provision of Rs. 75,000 made in the next year's budget. I also wish to remind this House that we have all along, in dealing with these buildings, shown consideration to works in progress. This question about the students' club came up last year and the provision was allowed to remain. If it was thought that the building was in an objectionable locality and that different steps should be taken, the better course would have been for a specific motion of the description to be brought forward for the consideration of the Government and the necessary alteration would have been made. Having allowed that provision, I would request the mover himself to consider whether it is desirable to vote down the provision without pointing out at the same time a different building which would be useful for the purpose. So long as it is admitted that these buildings have been in existence and have been used for this purpose during the last three years, so long as it is clear to the members of this Council that the students have been using those buildings with profit and with advantage and so long as it is clear to us that we did allow this provision to remain in the budget of last year, I would request the House not to embark on a policy of undoing the work which has been done in the last two years without having a proper substitute for it. I think also that it would be setting up a bad precedent. But when the Government are in a position to allot larger funds for this purpose, and when we can think of changing the building and having another university students' club, then it would be time enough to consider the suggestion of the hon. Mover as to what to do with the property and whether it would fetch good value or not. But till that time arrives and till the Government or the Minister assures us that he is prepared to find funds on a larger scale and provide a new students' club, I would entreat every one in the House not to take away the institution in existence before taking up another building useful for the purpose. For these reasons, I oppose this motion."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of

5 p.m. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. As pointed out by Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, I do not see why such a large sum as

Rs. 75,000 should be spent upon it if the place is going to be sold. If the Council thinks that this is a place not suitable and wishes to have a central place in a better locality, I do not see any use for the Government spending such a large sum. I agree with my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi that a

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Subbarayan]

university club is a necessity, but what I say is that such a club should be in a suitable locality and not in the place where it is now. So I support the motion to omit the sum altogether."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Sir, I oppose this motion. My friend Mr. Subbarayan says that the surroundings are bad enough for students to live in. Students live in narrow streets and unhealthy lanes and under worse conditions. This club that was established in Georgetown is by far better than many of the hostels in Madras. Instead of accommodating themselves in filthy hotels this is surely a much better arrangement for the students and therefore I oppose this motion."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, it is very unfortunate that the hon. Member has chosen to press this motion. I expected, Sir, that after what fell from Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and after the lucid statement of the Minister for Education the hon. Mover would withdraw this motion. He has not done so. And I must say, Sir, that this University Students' Club is a splendid institution which is doing wonderfully good work. First of all I may say, it serves the purpose of a hostel for the Medical and Law students, as also for the other students in Madras. There is only one other hostel, the Victoria Hostel, and this University Club is supposed to supplement the little relief that the Victoria Hostel is giving to the numerous students. Secondly, it serves the purpose of a club where the students are weaned away from undesirable influences and have the advantages of some recreations. Now, Sir, the only objection that is raised against the club is, as stated by Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, that the club is a luxury. All seem to concede the principle of a club. But that it is not a luxury has been very well explained by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. It is by itself an integral part of any University system. Another objection is that it is in a bad locality. There was a Lock hospital there originally. But it can be made quite suitable for students and its unhealthiness also could be set right. The club has gone on for nearly three years and there have been no complaints of its insanitary nature and we have nothing to conclude that this is in an unhealthy quarter. However, that question might still be considered by the Minister for Education before he embarks on further expenditure. And then if he thinks that it is not quite suitable he may make up his mind to select another place. Sir, a sum of Rs. 11,000 has already been spent upon it and the building has been voted upon in the last year's budget and it went unchallenged. For all these reasons, I appeal to the hon. the Mover not to press the motion, especially when he concedes the principle of founding a club like this."

The motion was then put to the House and lost.

Motions 720 to 742.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

720. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

721. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

[25th March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

722. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

723. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

724. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for constructing a new chemistry block for the Presidency College.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

725. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for the New General Hospital, Cocanada.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

726. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for additions to the Agricultural College and Research Institute.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

727. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 70,000 for constructing buildings for the cattle farm at Ohintaladevi.*

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—

728. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for the construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

729. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

730. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000, for wages of coolies.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

731. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000 for wages of coolies.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

732. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

733. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

734. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for improvements to roads at the main gate of the Government House.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

735. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,14,500 for repairs to Civil Works— Civil buildings for west coast by Rs. 100.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

736. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,24,000 for repairs to Civil Works in the Nilgiris by Rs. 100.*

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

737. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for one assistant to the consulting architect.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

738. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

739. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

740. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers on the specialist scale by Rs. 7,475.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

741. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers by Rs. 7,475.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

742. *To reduce the allotment for 4 assistant sanitary engineers by the cost of 3.*

Motion 743.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

743. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,846 for one temporary assistant sanitary engineer.*

“Sir, I must say that the present establishment of the Sanitary Engineering department consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and four assistant engineers. This question of the establishment necessary for the sanitary engineering department was considered at length by the Finance Committee in consultation with the Chief Engineer and the decision of the Finance Committee was there should be one sanitary engineer, one deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant engineer. It was represented to me afterwards that it was necessary to have one deputy sanitary engineer more to provide one for the North and one for the South. In accepting that arrangement we thought we could allow two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and the rest who are temporary could go. This was what we thought and we have also expressed that. One deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant sanitary engineer are already permanent and the others have been temporarily drafted from the Public Works Department and so there will be no difficulty in asking those not wanted to revert to their permanent places.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, there is a good deal of justification in asking the temporary men to revert to their former places. I shall be prepared to consider it.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, as the hon. the Minister has not said that he accepts it, I press the motion.”

The motion was put to the House and carried.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 744.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

744. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for assistant sanitary engineer*

" Sir, this is the second of the appointments mentioned by me in the previous motion and it can go. The other appointment has already been voted against."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I agree."

The motion was put and carried.

Motion 745.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

5-15 p.m.

745. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,350 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.*

" In fact, as has been already pointed out, there are one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, there are still left two assistant sanitary engineers. Their work is very little and I do not think there is need for a personal assistant to the sanitary engineer. In fact the whole allotment for works is only about Rs. 8 lakhs and there is not a pretty large number of works, and at this rate it will take six years more for finishing the works that are already in progress. There are other works that are sanctioned but waiting to be executed, works waiting to be sanctioned and works waiting for the preparation of plans and so on. Practically there is no work for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" The specialist cadre consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers. Now, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant, because he has to do a lot of routine work and he has also to attend to the drawings. It may be we have not got much work to do at present, but there are large number of schemes for which plans and estimates have been prepared last year and which have been scrutinized by the chief engineer, and there are also other schemes for which plans and estimates are under preparation. When the sanitary engineer goes on tour, it is necessary that there should be a responsible officer at the headquarters to look after the office. Therefore, as in the case of every other chief officer, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant to look after the office work during his absence on tour. Though it may seem that he has no work now, under ordinary circumstances it will be found necessary to have a personal assistant. The personal assistant is not borne on the cadre of specialists. So it is very necessary to retain the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am at a loss to understand the arguments of the hon. the Minister. There are four officers in this office besides the sanitary engineer, namely, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and they are all in one and the same place. At least one of them can be expected to be at the headquarters while the others are away on tour. In fact, I do not see, Sir, any

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

necessity for a personal assistant in an office like this. If the officers are posted in different places, then I can understand the necessity for this post. In the case of the other chief officers, there may be necessity for a personal assistant because there is no other officer capable of doing the work in the absence of the chief officer. But in this particular case, Sir, all these five officers are in the same place and I do not see there is any necessity for a personal assistant at all. The argument of the hon. the Minister does not at all take account of the officers besides the Sanitary Engineer. Now, I am sure, he will find his way to accept the resolution that has been moved."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I only wish to emphasise the point that we cannot subscribe to the suggestion of the hon. the Minister for Public Works that every officer should have a personal assistant. I do not think that it is the standpoint from which we must look at this question. We must consider each case on its merits. In this particular case if the sanitary engineer has got sufficient work to require a personal assistant, then it is our duty to sanction it. If, on the other hand, there is not sufficient work, there is no necessity for sanctioning this post. The statement made by the hon. the Minister that this year he has not got sufficient work is itself sufficient to justify the deletion of the appointment. So far as the increase of work in future years is concerned, I think we can deal with such cases as they arise. I think it is our duty now not to vote for this personal assistant. If the work accumulates and if it is found necessary to have this officer, it will be time enough for the hon. the Minister to bring in a motion for renewing the appointment. There is no necessity for continuing the post."

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR:—"I only want to ask for information. I find from the list of officers a large number of Assistant Sanitary Engineers and also an office manager. I want to know whether this personal assistant is a technically qualified officer like the sanitary engineer himself, so that he can render technical aid to the sanitary engineer and look after the technical section of the work also during his absence, or whether he has simply to run the office and get the routine work done, in which case there is the office manager to do such things. I should like to have this information."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"The personal assistant is a technical man and he has been in service for thirty years."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Let us see what the work of this whole of the Sanitary Engineer's Department is. They are not an executive staff. Their work consists mainly in drawing up plans and estimates for water-works and drainage schemes, and giving advice to the Government and to the officers of the ordinary Public Works Department."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I propose to give them also execution work in the case of the schemes prepared by them, and a specialist cadre has been formed to carry on this work."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I was speaking of the work that they now do and not of what is proposed to be given to them hereafter. When that measure is adopted the Government can come forward and ask for more establishment. As it is, their work consists in designing certain schemes and in giving advice with reference to water-works and drainage

[Mr M. Krishnan Nayar]

[25th March 1922]

schemes. When once these schemes are completed, the actual execution of the work is entrusted to the ordinary officers of the Public Works Department and, as I submitted, there are now one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and, even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, two more assistant sanitary engineers, so that there are five officers, and if my information is correct, all these officers are located in the same building and the only other work that they have is to inspect and examine the drainage works and water-works that have already been completed. With reference to this inspection of water-works which are 29 in number, the personal assistant has nothing to do, because he has only got office management. Even if somebody is necessary to look after the work in the office during the absence of the sanitary engineer, there are the other officers like the deputy sanitary engineers and the assistant sanitary engineers, and it is absolutely unnecessary to have the personal assistant also. This resolution is not intended to send away the present personal assistant. When he retires the vacancy need not be filled up. When that contingency arises, there is no need to have this post."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"If this resolution is passed, it will be necessary to pass an order to send him away and he will lose his pay for the month of March."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I do not care for the consequences. I believe, as my hon. Friend has told us that he has already put in thirty years' service, he can very well be sent away."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I have given notice of a motion to do away with the whole establishment and I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my views on that matter."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I daresay the hon. Member realizes that the present motion is with reference to the appointment of the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer, whether it is necessary to retain the provision for his post or not. We are not at present concerned with the question of the whole establishment."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I suppose the qualifications of these officers in the sanitary establishment are the same as those of Public Works department officers and I know that several ordinary Public Works department officers do sanitary work also. I do not see any difference between the qualifications of one set of officers and those of the other set, and therefore there is no necessity at all for an establishment costing Rs. 1.61 lakhs annually, and as we are agreed already that a major portion of this item should be cut down, I think the personal assistant also may be done away with."

"There is one more point. The sanitary engineer also may not be necessary, and his place may very well be taken by one of the deputy sanitary engineers, and if the arrangement for doing away with the sanitary engineer is agreed to, the whole department can be run by the two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers, and I hope the hon. the Minister will think of giving effect to this suggestion."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI:—"No case of necessity is made out for a personal assistant in the present case. I take this opportunity of

25th March 1922] [Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai]

saying that as a rule the practice of giving a personal assistant to the head of an office or department must be discouraged as much as possible, unless the Government is prepared to make the head of the office idle or to keep on an incompetent man."

A poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 25. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 26. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharu. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 27. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 28. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 29. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 6. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 30. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 31. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 32. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 9. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 33. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 34. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 11. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 35. Mr. S. Arpadaswami Udaiyar. |
| 12. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 37. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| 15. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 39. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampen. |
| 16. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 41. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 42. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | 43. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 44. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur K. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 45. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib. |
| 22. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 46. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | |
| 24. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 9. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 10. Mr. R. Littlehailes. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 11. Mr. E. Periyanaayagam. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 14. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| 7. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 15. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 16. Mr. S. Muttumanikka Achari. |
| | 17. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |

The motion was carried, 46 voting for and 17 against it.

Motion 746.

The following motion therefore fell through :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

746. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,350 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.

Motion 747.

5-30 p.m. The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

747. To omit the allotment of Rs 1,61,575 for sanitary engineering department.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 748.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

748. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,88,613 for establishment by Rs. 2,00,000.*

“ I want to raise a question which I have raised more than once in the Finance Committee that one way in which the extraordinary cost of the establishment could be reduced is by taking away all the intermediate officers between the district officers and those at the headquarters. It was thought so far as the Public Works department was concerned that the question of the abolition of the superintending engineers was a matter which required the scrutiny of the Government. It was said, Sir, that the superintending engineers had a lot of work to do besides ordinary supervision and it was said that in regard to estimates, they had the power of sanction beyond a certain limit and that the work could not be left either to the executive engineer or to the Chief Engineer. Sir, in regard to this matter, by the kindness of the Chief Engineer I was able to get some insight into the working of the office and I found, Sir, that in this department as in others there was much room for decentralization. It was said that a deputy secretary was necessary at the headquarters because the superintending engineers were not scrutinizing some of the estimates sent to the Chief Engineer. It was said that the estimates were sent directly to the headquarters and that they were not scrutinized by the superintending engineer. It was said, Sir, that these estimates were scrutinized by the Chief Engineer's office. In regard to a large number of works the Superintending Engineer gives his sanction at the present moment and unless his work is decentralized in order to give a little more power to the executive engineers, it may not be possible to reduce the number of superintending engineers. It was also said that these superintending engineers were also inspectors of local board works and as such they could not be removed. It seems to me, Sir, if only the principle of decentralization is given effect to and more powers are given to the executive engineers and if the estimates that pass from the superintending engineers are scrutinized by them and not merely sent in a post office like fashion, I think there will be room for taking away the deputy secretary in the office and though it will not be possible to take away all the superintending engineers it seems to me there is room for reducing the number by one or two. These are matters which I should like that the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer would consider deeply and if they only accept the principle of decentralization and try to carry it out we can make large savings. It is with the intention of drawing the attention of the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer to this aspect of the matter that I make this motion.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I may say that the Public Works department has done its best in going into the matter of the whole establishment and cutting it down as far as possible. For some time to come this department will have to work under considerable difficulty and disadvantage. A large number of officers having been dispensed with, we have to reorganize the department, redistribute the work, and re-adjust the jurisdiction. My hon. Friend Mr. A. Subbarayudu has referred to the large number of

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

officers that were dispensed with ; nevertheless redistribution of the work is a great problem for us. While we have done so much in the office recently, it is rather too much for my friend to press the matter again. In course of time I hope to be able to examine with the assistance of the Chief Engineer how far decentralization could be given effect to and the work could be reduced. Unless the work is reduced at the Chief Engineer's office, it is not possible to dispense with any of the officers now in existence. I have already told the House in my general remarks about the necessity and desirability of retaining the superintending engineers. They fill a place that is absolutely necessary in the scheme of the work of the Public Works department. It is impossible that they could be eliminated in carrying out the works. There are large responsibilities vested in the superintending engineer. While the executive engineers are entirely entrusted with carrying out the execution of works according to plans and estimates, the superintending engineers have to supervise their work and they have got also some original powers. It is not possible for me to assure my friend, but I am quite willing to consider all that he has said and see whether we can work on with the limited establishment we have now."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" As I said, Sir, my intention in bringing this motion was to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister for his consideration and examination, the question of further retrenchment in the establishment of this department and in view of the remarks of the hon. the Minister, I do not press my motion and beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 749.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

749. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,36,692 for Civil Works by 5,00,000.*

" Sir, in moving for the reduction, I do not wish to take the House through the various allotments made in the public Works estimates, but I wish the House to consider whether it is not possible for us to put off out of the provision made for the next year a portion of the total allotment made.

" I do not wish to suggest that we should put off works in progress and that we should give up schemes already sanctioned or already in operation. But if we realize that we are required now to vote for large sums of money for civil works, however valuable and necessary the works may be, that we will be called upon to vote large sums of money as per supplemental motions of which notice has been given it will be apparent that a fresh reconsideration of the allotment made is necessary with the object of effecting retrenchment. If I put it at a sum of five lakhs, it is because I felt that if we confine our attention to urgent works and if we put off the completion of works in progress for another year, it will be possible for us to effect a saving in the provision to that extent. No doubt, while we were dealing with various specific motions, objections were raised as to the necessity for particular works. It was pointed out that we must provide for the residence of officers and for new Collector's office at Vellore regarding the policy of which no objection was taken. But in a year when we are required to strain every nerve to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [25th March 1922]

find additional funds by additional taxation and by other means it must be our duty to effect as much saving as we can. It is a small portion of the amount entered in the budget estimate that I wish to omit. I think the House may adopt the principle which it enunciated in dealing with some of the motions, not all, of making a reduction from the total grant."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I must say with due deference to my hon. Friend that it is most unfair that such a motion should be tabled in connexion with the Public Works Department. Having reduced six lakhs of rupees, having cut down 18 per cent of the establishment as it was originally proposed, the unfortunate rule that the House applied to the case of reduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 per cent should be applied to this case also seems to me doing great injustice to the department which has conscientiously and dutifully carried out the instructions of this House and of His Excellency. I am surprised that my hon. Friend should have pressed this motion at all and made a speech on it. If he had not known the fact that the only department that has done its best and loyally carried out the wishes of this House and of His Excellency, he would not press the motion. But having known that, that he should propose this motion seems to me unfair and ungenerous. Moreover, the allotment consists of voted and non-voted items and motions have been tabled asking for curtailment in various directions. Hon. Members have, either out of consideration for the subject, or for the reason that they were not able to support the motions, withdrawn them or abandoned them. In spite of it, that my hon. friend from Nellore should have tabled a motion for a reduction of five lakhs of rupees in a department which has already retrenched six lakhs of rupees seems to be doing the greatest injustice to the department and I am sure the House will not agree with him."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, my hon. Friend opposite has made an appeal to this House not to accept this motion on the ground that the department has already effected retrenchment in various directions and that we should not go further. I wish to draw a distinction between retrenchment effected in the case of reduction of establishments and that effected in the case of the allotment under works. I have not in my opening remarks made any reference to the reduction under establishment."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"My hon. Friend has not tabled any motion with reference to any particular work to be carried out to be eliminated."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I think my hon. Friend should have been patient to have understood my main point. As I stated in the beginning, I think that in matters of this description where one department or another has tried to include in the budget various works, if the House considers that it is necessary to effect a retrenchment under this head, I thought, Sir, and I even now think that it is more desirable to effect a reduction in the general allotment leaving the various departmental officers to put their heads together and see what works are urgent and what not. In that manner retrenchment can be effected; and it is for that reason and it is after due consideration that I proposed not to affect this particular item or that regarding which the head of departments had placed a provision in the budget, but to put it before the House whether, taking a proper view of the situation, we cannot reduce the total allotment by a specific sum. I believe

25th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

in the correctness of the course pursued by me. Now, Sir, regarding the suggestion made that in the case of a department that has already applied the pruning knife to a considerable extent we should be fair in pressing further, I quite accept the position that there has been substantial retrenchment effected in the department. I quite realize in the case of the establishment there has been a reduction to an extent to which I myself was not prepared to go. I am of opinion that with the limited establishment it may not be possible to spend this year any large amount. What I want to maintain and the House to consider is this: whether the House is entitled to vote for such a large sum and whether we cannot go further and reduce the allotment. I cannot at all understand the surprise of my hon. Friend regarding the position taken up by me when the allotment proposed to be affected is that on works. And then, my hon. Friend said that no specific item was mentioned. It was so because I wanted to give a wide latitude, an absolute discretion in the matter of selecting works to the officers concerned."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The list of works rests with the departments concerned and the Public Works department are merely agencies for carrying out the works demanded by the other departments of Government."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"That is the very reason why I stated already that the departmental officers ought to put their heads together and see what buildings can be put off. If I now referred to my hon. Friend opposite, it is not because I ignored that fact but because I wanted my hon. Friend who has no doubt been very earnest in retrenching to see whether some more money cannot be saved in this particular direction. I do not want to tie his hands or fetter his discretion or embarrass his position, but I only appeal to him to sit down quietly after this session has passed and to see whether some of the works proposed could not be put off for some time to come and whether expenditure on some buildings cannot be cut off so that we may save some more money in the year to come. I do not want to embarrass the position of my hon. Friend by pressing the motion to a division. With these remarks, I beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 750 and 751.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

750. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,36,692 for civil works by 100.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

751. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 78·11 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—Public Works officers by 10 lakhs."*

Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a grant of 78·11 lakhs minus Rs. 12,796 was then put and granted *nem. con.*

The House then adjourned at 5-45 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday the 27th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.